Campus Crusade for Christ Library

Paul W. Eastwood

Crusade for Christ Library

PRIMERS OF THE FAITH

Primers of The Faith

By

JAMES M. GRAY, D. D.

Minister of the Reformed Episcopal Church, Dean of the Moody Bible Institute, Author of "Synthetic Bible Studies," "How to Master the English Bible," "The Bulwarks of the Faith," "The History of the Holy Dead," etc.

I. How We Know the Bible is Genuine
II. How We Know the Bible is Credible
III. How We Know the Bible is Divine

New York Chicago Toronto
Fleming H. Revell Company
London and Edinburgh

Copyright, 1906, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

Campus Crusade for Christ Library

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
Chicago: 80 Wabash Avenue
Toronto: 27 Richmond Street, W.
London: 21 Paternoster Square
Edinburgh: 100 Princes Street

2832

475
G779
1906

Publisher's Note

THE chapters in this book originally appeared in serial form in a religious newspaper. The following taken from the announcement of that paper will explain sufficiently how it came into existence as well as its aim or purport:

In an address delivered before a recent convention of the American Bible League, the Rev. James A. Worden, D. D., LL. D., superintendent of the Sabbath-school and missionary work of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, laid great emphasis upon the pressing need of a Bible Primer or Primer of the Faith that would give in simple words the reply to the assaults of the critics upon the Bible. He said, "I may be regarded as representing, in a sense, the Bible students of this country. Let me tell you there are 1,200,000 Bible teachers in this country, and among them the best equipped, intelligent, practical Christians. They are firm believers in the inspiration of the Word, despite all that has been written, despite all that has been said for the last twenty-five years. They stand by your side, 1,200,000 strong, convinced, by the self-convincing power of the Bible and by the work of the Holy Spirit in their hearts, that this is a super-

natural, divine revelation, and that it is infallibly recorded in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

"What can you do for them? These people have their troubles; these teachers hear this criticism made upon the Pentateuch and upon the history in the Bible and upon Isaiah, and they do not know how to answer it.

"Now, we want Primers. Get the names of the hundred thousand superintendents of our Sabbath-schools. Send to them your plans. Tell them that you mean to resist the assaults made upon the Scriptures, with which they have some little trouble; and you will find they will respond. Of course there has not been a single allegation made by these destructive critics that has not been answered a hundred times. They are well known to you and to me. They are well known in the circles of theologically trained men. We have no doubts about them; but the answers have never been circulated; they have never been published or printed in elementary form so that our Sabbath-school teachers and superintendents could have them in form easily understood so as to satisfy their minds."

There could be no question about the choice of the man for the work. No one in the country fitted it so well as Dr. James M. Gray.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

His qualifications for just this work are exceptional. Besides teaching the Bible in great popular Bible classes, and in lessons distributed throughout the United States and Canada through the medium of our columns, he has been an instructor in different seminaries and Bible institutes in Biblical introduction. He is now the Dean of the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, the parent, and still by far the largest of all institutes in this country, if not in the world. For several years all his work has been among young people, from whom he has received the heartiest response and most grateful appreciation given in recent years to any Bible teacher.

A Foreword

PRIMERS of the Faith, as the title indicates, are written not for scholars but for what Abraham Lincoln was wont to call the "plain people," the average layman. They are intended to help Sunday School teachers, Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A. workers, and students of the grade found in such Bible institutes as that with which the author is connected. Some of these will wish to pursue their inquiries further, but for the great majority this is not likely to be true. It is the need of this majority that will be especially kept in view.

We have a book called the Bible, for which the claim is made that it is a revelation from God. We want to know how it came into our possession; also whether its statements of fact and truth are to be relied upon; and finally, if they are to be relied upon we need to inquire into their source and the influence they should exert upon our daily conduct and our hope for the life to come.

The first of these inquiries will be considered in Part I. under the general title, "How We Know the Bible is Genuine." The second in Part II., under the title, "How We Know the Bible is Credible." And the last, in Part III., "How We Know the Bible is Divine."

The author prepared an earlier work on this same general subject entitled, "The Bulwarks of the Faith;" but discoveries have been made in various branches of study and research which make it desirable to deal with it anew. and in more detail than was contemplated then. References

may be made to that work and quotations taken from it from time to time, but otherwise the contents of the "Primers of the Faith" will be new.

Let us pray for the blessing of God to accompany our study together for the strengthening of our faith and our better equipment as his servants in dealing with honest inquirers after truth.

JAMES M. GRAY.

The Moody Bible Institute, Chicago

Contents

PART I

HOW WE KNOW THE BIBLE IS GENUINE

I.	The Names of the Bible	1
II.	Tracing the Records	4
III.	Examining the Text	9
IV.	The English Versions	14
V.	How the Books Came Together	20
VI.	Why I Believe Moses Wrote the Pentateuch	24
VII.	Why Question the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch?	28
VIII.	Answering the Critics	32
IX.	The Early Historical Books	37
X.	Two Isaiahs, or One?	43
XI.	The Other Major Prophets	49
XII.	"Daniel in the Critic's Den"	54
XIII.	The Minor Prophets	60
XIV.	Is Jonah Historic?	65
XV.	The "Holy Writings"	70
XVI.	The Poetical Books	75
XVII.	The Titles of the Psalms	80

CONTENTS

XVIII.	The Wisdom Literature	86
XIX.	The Old Testament Apocrypha	90
XX.	The New Testament Canon	95
XXI.	Why Four Gospels?	101
XXII.	The Story of the Synoptics	107
XXIII.	Did the Apostle John Write the Fourth Gospel?	115
XXIV.	Internal Evidences of John's Gospel	121
XXV.	The Book of the Acts	127
XXVI.	Paul's Epistles—the First and Second Groups	133
XXVII.	Paul's Epistles—the Third Group	141
XXVIII.	The Pastoral Epistles	149
XXIX.	The Epistle to the Hebrews	155
XXX.	The Epistle of James	161
XXXI.	The Epistles of Peter and Jude	165
XXXII.	The Epistles and Revelation of John	171

PART II

HOW WE KNOW THE BIBLE IS CREDIBLE

	Introductory	177
I.	The Bible as a Historic Fact	180
II.	Evidence of the Pickaxe and the Spade	185
III.	More Buried Proofs	191

CONTENTS

IV.	The Contents of the Bible a Proof of its Credibility	197
V.	Judaism and Other Ancient Religions	201
VI.	The Mummy and the Tower of Silence	206
VII.	Christianity and Buddhism	212
VIII.	Christianity and Mohammedanism	218
IX.	Christianity and all Other Religions	225
X.	Miracles — Their Definition and Proof	231
XI.	Miracles—the False and the True	237
XII.	Prophecy—Its Value	244
XIII.	Prophecy—Its Nature	250
XIV.	The Idea of Jesus Christ	256
XV.	Christianity Overcoming Difficulties	261
XVI.	Christianity Meeting with Success	266
XVII.	Christianity Judged by its Historical Effects	272

PART III

HOW WE KNOW THE BIBLE IS DIVINE

I.	The Meaning of Inspiration	277
II.	The Argument for Inspiration	282
III.	The Bible Claim of Inspiration	287
IV.	The Objections to Inspiration	292

PART I

How We Know the Bible is Genuine

How We Know the Bible is Genuine.

CHAPTER I.

THE NAMES OF THE BIBLE.

THE Bible received its name from the Greek word "Biblos," which means book, and is divided into the New and Old Testaments. "Testament" means covenant or agreement, and is a term descriptive of the relation existing between God and his people under different dispensations. See Hebrews 8:6-13 for a Scriptural use of this word.

In the earlier times among the Jews the Old Testament was divided into three parts, the whole being known as "The Law, The Prophets and The Holy Writings." The last division was sometimes called "The Psalms." See, for example, Luke 24:24. The history of this three-fold division is not known positively, but it is thought to mark three stages in the origin of the books or in the process of collecting them.

By "The Law" was meant the first five books of Moses; by "The Psalms," or "Holy Writings," was meant the following named books, which are here given in the order appearing in our Bibles:—Ruth, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Lament-

ations, Daniel; by "The Prophets" was meant all the other books of the Old Testament both historical and prophetical. This last-named division was sometimes sub-divided again into the "Former" and "Latter" prophets. By the "Former" prophets was meant the historical books, such as Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings; and by the "Latter" was meant the prophetical books distinctively.

The Bible is sometimes called "The Canon," from a Greek word which means a "rod" or "rule." The word is used to distinguish the accepted books of the Bible from the Apocryphal, which will be spoken of again. The Bible is "The Canon" in the sense that it is the rod or rule by which to determine what is to be believed by the people of God and the standard for them to practice. For its Scriptural use see 2 Corinthians 10:13-16, Galatians 6:16.

It should be understood, however, that the canonization of a book does not mean that the Jewish nation in the one case or the Christian church in the other gave to that book its authority; but rather that its authority being already established on other and sufficient grounds, it was in consequence recognized as properly belonging to the Canon and so declared to be. Jewish scholars in the one case and Christian scholars in the other thus formed the Canon under divine guidance, after careful inquiry and investigation concerning what books were of inspired origin and what were not so inspired. Just how this inquiry and investiga-

tion were carried on will appear more clearly as our studies proceed.

After these preliminary statements we are now in a position to ask and answer the question, how the Bible or the Canon, as we now have it, came to be handed down to us? In other words, we are now to trace the history of the Bible along the stream of time as nearly as possible to its source.

CHAPTER II.
TRACING THE RECORDS.

THERE is no difficulty in tracing the history of the Bible during the last five centuries because of the art of printing and modern book-making; but when we leave the anchorage of the types and launch forth on the sea of manuscripts we need to know something of navigation.

Let it be understood at the outset, that by a manuscript of the Bible is meant not a written copy in any language, but one in the original tongues only. For example, a manuscript of the Old Testament is always in Hebrew, and one of the New Testament is always in Greek. Now there are many written copies of the Bible in other languages known as versions, by which we can trace its history easily down the stream of time to the period of Christ and his apostles, and in the case of the Old Testament much earlier, but as a matter of fact, the earliest manuscript of the Old Testament of which scholars know, is one dating from the tenth century of the Christian era.

At once the question arises as to the cause of this. Why is it that we possess no manuscripts of the Old Testament of an earlier date than the tenth century of the Christian era? It is impossible to answer this question with historical precision, but there are one or two facts which aid us to approx-

imate an answer. One is the sublime reverence of the Jews for their sacred writings, and another is the existence for centuries of a class of Hebrew scholars whose office was to study, interpret, and transcribe those writings. A kind of self-perpetuating body of these men, known as the Massoretes, began as early as about the first century of the Christian era to collect and examine manuscripts with a view to the preparation of what would be called in these days an accepted text of the Old Testament. Their work was laboriously and patiently pursued for centuries, closing about the ninth, and it is supposed that with the setting forth of the results of their great work, all pre-existing manuscripts were destroyed because of the feeling of reverence previously referred to. Thus, to quote the language of another, "By the work of the Massoretes and their predecessors from the close of the first century onwards, the stream of the transmitted Hebrew text was made to run in a clear-cut channel and guarded from the possibility of defilement."

But as already indicated, it must not be supposed that because we have no Hebrew manuscript of a date earlier than the tenth century of the Christian era, we are therefore unable to trace the history of the Old Testament any further back. As a matter of fact, we have more ways than one of doing this.

For example, after the manuscripts, come what are known as the "Targums." The word "Targum"

means literally an "Interpretation." When the Jews were carried into Babylon, B. C. 588, they gradually ceased to employ the Hebrew as a spoken language, although in their synagogues the sacred oracles were still read in that tongue. Necessity, therefore, compelled its interpretation in their synagogue service, which was done in a kind of running commentary or paraphrase, which at first spoken, came subsequently to be written and to take the name of "Targum."

These "Targums" were in the Chaldea or Eastern Aramaic dialect, and were, no doubt, numerous, although those which have descended to us are all dated after the Christian era, the oldest of which, covering only a part of the Old Testament, dates from about the seventh century. It can readily be seen how important these are in identifying the existence of the Old Testament at that early period.

Back of these "Targums" again, we have certain versions of the Old Testament, or copies in the Greek language, of as early a date as the fourth century, and others indeed of the second, of which more will be said in detail when we reach the story of the New Testament, because they are bound up with manuscripts of that part of the Bible as well. It should be added now, however, that all these versions with one possible exception, are copies of a still earlier one known as the Septuagint, dating back as early as the third century before Christ. This version gets its name, which means "seventy,"

from a company of Hebrew scholars of that number, engaged it is said by Ptolemy Philadelphus, King of Egypt, to prepare the work for the Alexandrian library. It was begun somewhere about 285 B. C., but the date of its conclusion is not so well ascertained. In the early church this version was deemed of great value, and it is that used very frequently by the inspired writers in their quotations in the New Testament.

We thus see that by a chain of very few links the Old Testament of our day is joined to that of Christ's day, and indeed to that antedating Christ's day by nearly three centuries. These links are the printed Bible down to the fifteenth century, the manuscripts to the tenth, the "Targums" to the seventh, the versions to the fourth and back as early as the second, with the Septuagint carrying us to the third century B. C.

One may indeed ask whether it be not a long period to account for between the third century B. C., and the fifth, when lived and flourished Ezra, the latest of the inspired writers? But the answer is in the negative. If the books we call the Old Testament were in canonical form in the third century, it is clear that they must have been in existence as separate books prior to that time. Now two hundred, or even two hundred and fifty years, are not a long time for the formation of a canon, as we shall be able to judge better by and by when we come to consider the history of that of the New Testament.

President Patton in his lecture on "The Seat of Authority in Religion," employs an illustration which fits admirably in this case. "If we are journeying on a railroad train, we do not insist that it shall deposit us in our porte-cochere, but are satisfied to be left at the railroad station because we can easily walk the rest of the way." If, in other words, the records of the canon of the Old Testament bring us to within two or three centuries of the date of the last of the inspired writers, there is no strain on the imagination in supplying the final connecting link.

But any who may not be satisfied with that remark will be able to rest in this. Remember that the Septuagint was in existence and in use in Palestine in the days of Christ and his apostles. He set his seal to its genuineness as the sum and substance of the sacred Scriptures. The Old Testament as we now have it was that which, as a man, "fed the springs of his life, fashioned his thought, moulded his message," and led him to the cross as the suffering Messiah of which it testified. Can we desire stronger evidence than this? Who would not trust that which Jesus trusted?

CHAPTER III.

EXAMINING THE TEXT.

IN THE last chapter we traced the records of the Old Testament to the time of Christ and his apostles, and beyond; but before entering upon the particular theme of the present chapter we should do the same for the New Testament. After we pass the era of the printed Bible we find the New Testament like the Old in manuscript form, the oldest of which manuscripts carry us back to the fourth century. The three oldest are the Alexandrian, or Codex "A," the Vatican, or Codex "B," and the Sinaitic, or Codex "Aleph." The last two are certainly of the fourth century, and the first-named, of the earlier part of the fifth.

It is notable also that the custody of these three is divided between the three great branches of the Christian church, the Protestant, the Roman Catholic, and the Greek, in the order named. The first is deposited in the British Museum, the second in the Vatican Library, and the third in the Royal Library at St. Petersburg. The fact that these three manuscripts are thus held by the three branches of the Christian church,in which there has been much rivalry and contention on doctrinal points, has contributed much to the preservation of

the integrity of the text and the evidence of its genuineness.

Back of these manuscripts we trace the history of the New Testament through the versions of the second century, as in the case of the Old Testament. There are two versions of that century, the Latin and the Syriac, sometimes called the "Peshito," which means "literal." These versions were referred to in speaking of the Old Testament, and it is in order here to say that they contain the Old Testament as well as the New. The former of the two was the Bible of the Western and the latter the Bible of the Eastern church in that early day.

Of course, it is not claimed that these versions are in existence today, but through the copies of them which we possess and the testimony concerning them in the writings of the early church fathers, there is no question as to their existence at that time. The Syriac, it is believed, dated from about 150 A. D., but as the books which formed its collection must have existed for some time previously in a separate form, its history practically brings us back to the close of the apostolic age at the end of the first century when John, the last of the apostles, died.

We thus see, in summing up, that as early as the middle of the second century of the Christian era, and in the case of the Old Testament as early as the middle of the third century before Christ, there existed the same books as those now in our Bible,

ascribed to the same authority and containing in all material points the same text.

This applies to all the books of the Old Testament without exception, and to all of the New with the exception of 2 Peter. It is true that the Latin version of the second century omitted Hebrews, James and 2 Peter, and that the Syriac omitted 2 and 3 John, Jude, Revelation, and 2 Peter; but putting these two versions of the same century together we have all the books of our Bible excepting 2 Peter. And what is even more remarkable we have no other books than those now in our Bible. The reason for the omission of 2 Peter and the circumstances under which it came subsequently to be received into the Canon, will be presented in a later chapter.

We are now ready to proceed with the particular subject assigned for this chapter, namely, the examination of the text. For example, it has been stated above, that our Bible is the same as that of the early manuscripts and versions in all material points, a qualification which at once suggests the query as to the points in which it is not absolutely and precisely the same. In answering this query we come face to face with another concerning the "various readings" of the manuscripts and versions, about which we have been hearing a great deal. To understand this question it should be borne in mind that multitudinous copies of the Bible have been made in different tongues and different ages, showing evidence of misapprehension of the text in

some places and carelessness in others. To quote another here, "Even printed books often contain numerous inaccuracies in spite of the most careful reading of proof-sheets; and in writing the risk is much greater than in printing, revision and correction of each copy being necessary and laborious. Sometimes the writer transcribed from a manuscript before him and sometimes from dictation. In the one case his ear was liable to deceive him, in another his eye. Misunderstanding of the manuscript from which the transcriber wrote may sometimes have led to error. Its abbreviations may have been misinterpreted or its words inaccurately divided.

Now it is the province of Bible criticism to examine these "various readings" of which there are very many, hundreds of thousands indeed, in order to determine the correct text. There are definite rules by which this examination is conducted, and so scientifically has it been accomplished that, as Bishop Westcott says: "Seven-eighths of the words are raised above all doubt whatsoever by a unique combination of authorities, while the questions forming the remaining one-eighth are, for the most part, simply those of order and form; so that in the last analysis not the slightest possible question can arise over more than one sixtieth part of the whole text."

The late Dr. Ezra Abbott, of Harvard University, an authority on questions of textual criticism, almost as distinguished as Bishop Westcott himself,

and quoted by the writer in "The Bulwarks of the Faith," dismisses nineteen-twentieths of these "various readings" from consideration altogether as obviously of no importance, nineteen-twentieths of the remainder as relating to matters of spelling, grammar, construction and order of words without affecting the sense; and then adds that even what is still left does not involve an important historical fact or essential doctrine or revelation, but at the farthest only the number of proof-texts by which it may be sustained.

Acts 8:37 and 1 John 5:7, 8, are illustrations in point. Neither of these verses appear in the Revised Version, because the testimony to their genuineness did not appear to be sufficient. They refer indeed to doctrines of the greatest importance, but their existence in the text is not at all essential to the enunciation and establishment of those doctrines, as even the most cursory reader of the Bible and the least intelligent of Christians knows. It would be very interesting, indeed, to go further into details in the examination of the text and give illustrations of the "various readings" so-called, but for this the reader must be referred to larger and more pretentious works, in which connection I should like to name "The Angus-Green Cyclopedic Hand-book to the Bible," by the late Joseph Angus, D. D., to which especially the new edition, indebtedness is acknowledged.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ENGLISH VERSIONS.

IN tracing the records of the Bible thus far, we have said more or less about certain versions, but there is one version which interests us more than the rest, and whose history we should be familiar with before proceeding to other branches of our subject. I refer, of course, to the English version or versions.

The history of the English versions begins really with the story of the Latin version of the second century, to which reference was made in the preceding chapter. This Latin version is not now in existence, but scholars are agreed that it was the ground-work of another version in the same tongue prepared in the fourth century by Jerome, and known as "The Vulgate." The word "Vulgate" in the Latin means the vulgar, or the common, tongue, that is, the vernacular of the people as distinguished from the scholarly and classic Greek.

This "Vulgate" was the only Bible of the Anglo-Saxon down until the close of the middle ages or the end of the 14th century, and is still the only Bible followed by the Roman Catholics in all their translation work, furnishing the basis of their Douay version of the Old Testament and their

Rhenish version of the New Testament. These names are given to those versions from the French cities in which the translation, in each case, was accomplished.

Towards the close of the seventh century, metical paraphrases of parts of the "Vulgate" were translated into the Anglo-Saxon tongue by a Yorkshire monk, and a little later the Bishop of Sherborne translated fifty of the Psalms into the same tongue. In the next century (about 735), the Venerable Bede, as he is called, translated the Gospel of John, but it was not until the rise of John Wyckliffe, the Morning Star of the Reformation, in 1382, that the whole Bible was ever known in the English tongue.

Although his work was in manuscript, copies of which were expensive, and although its circulation was strongly opposed by the priests, yet it was eagerly sought by the people and had a comparatively large circulation. Wyckliffe preachers, as they were called, went about the country reading its pages to the people and reciting its contents in their sermons.

One hundred years later, when printing had become known, William Tyndale utilized it for the publication of another English version of the New Testament, translating it from the original Greek sources. Because of persecution in his own country, most of this work was done at Cologne and at Worms, the whole being completed in 1526, and

smuggled into England, packed in bales of cloth and sacks of flour.

It also enjoyed a large circulation, stirring up his enemies to various efforts to exterminate it, until finally the Bishop of London purchased and burned all available copies; but with the proceeds thus obtained, a second and better edition followed. The same translator, still an exile, began work on the Old Testament, the successful conclusion of which, however, was defeated by the malice of his foes, who at length caused him to perish at the stake.

"The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church." Tyndale's work took root, and in less than three years after his death, an edition of the whole of the Scriptures, called "The Great Bible," was published under royal authority, and became the first authorized copy of the English Bible. In 1560 the "Geneva Bible" was published, so-named after the city in which the translation occurred, and was the work of a number of scholarly exiles. It was popular for half a century, being the first to appear in Roman type. In 1568 the "Bishops Bible" appeared, under the auspices of Archbishop Parker and other ecclesiastics of the Church of England, but did not possess the popularity of its immediate forerunner.

Finally the King James Version appeared, which has been known as the "Authorized" down to our own day. A company of fifty-four learned and devout men were selected by the king for this under-

taking, forty-seven of whom actually engaged in the task which continued for four years, from 1603 to 1607. The value of this version is borne witness to by its long and blessed history.

And yet as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century, if not earlier, the leaders of the church felt the necessity for a revised version of the King James, a necessity which became more and more apparent as the church advanced in the knowledge of the original languages of the Bible and as archaeological research caused the converging of greater light upon the meaning of names of persons and places in the sacred text. The Anglo-Saxon tongue itself indeed had been undergoing changes in the course of the centuries which made a revised version desirable, if not necessary.

Accordingly, the first international and interdenominational effort to prepare an English version of the Scriptures originated in the Convocation of Canterbury, of the Church of England, May 6, 1870, when sixty-five men were selected for the work, forty-one of whom belonged to that church and twenty-four to other Christian bodies, including the Church of Ireland, the Church of Scotland, the Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and Methodists, with power to add to their numbers representatives from America. In the following year, the American Committee was formed to cooperate with the English, consisting of thirty-four men of different denominations.

The labors of the joint committees covered sev-

eral years, the New Testament company completing its work November 11, 1880, and the Old Testament company, June 20, 1884. It is an interesting fact to be remembered that when the New Testament revision was published in May 1881, one million copies were sold the first day, the issue appearing on both sides of the Atlantic simultaneously. Moreover, the whole of it was telegraphed from New York to Chicago in time to appear in a secular daily in the last-named city on the following day. Such circumstances as these indicate the strong hold of the Bible upon the popular mind.

This English version, known as the "Revised," is, in my judgment, best used not as a substitute for the King James, but as a commentary upon it. It has not yet supplanted the latter in either public or private use, and it were well that it should not do so. Superior as it is in most particulars, yet some of its textual changes are inferior in scholarship to the King James and even harmful in their tendencies to the Christian faith. 2 Timothy 3:16 is a case in point, and several others are pointed out in Dean Burgon's "Revision Revised" and Newton's "Remarks on the Revised Version." The changes referred to were made by a two-thirds vote of the Committee, and some of the most notable and devout scholars engaged were not always present on these occasions.

Let us stand by the King James for a while longer, using the Revised to throw light upon it here

and there as a kind of critical commentary. My own plan is to use the Two-Version Bible in which I have all the results of the revision very conveniently in the margin.

CHAPTER V.

HOW THE BOOKS CAME TOGETHER.

IN chapters 2 and 3 we traced the history of the Old and New Testaments to the period of Christ in the one case, and to the third century before Christ in the other, and the remark was made that while some time had elapsed in both instances between the passing away of the last of the inspired writers and the appearance of the books in canonical arrangement, yet after all the distance was not so great, under the circumstances, as to place an insupportable strain on the imagination in supplying the missing link.

We are now to inquire how much of a strain this is, or whether it is a strain at all. We shall try to pierce the darkness and exercise ourselves to find the missing link. How did the books come together?

Confining ourselves to the Old Testament in this chapter and those immediately following, we shall consider first, what is known as the traditional view in which the Canon was formed, and then take up each division of the Old Testament in detail, giving attention to the more serious objections to this view, which come under the modern name of the "higher criticism."

The traditional view is somewhat as follows:—The first five books of the Law were written by Moses and deposited in the Tabernacle by the side of the Ark of the Covenant in which lay the two tables of the Decalogue (see Deut. 17 and 18; 31-9-26). It was in this same book that Joshua wrote the Covenant of Shechem (24:26), and that afterward Samuel added the manner of the kingdom (1 Samuel 10:25). This collection of writings, subsequently transferred from the Tabernacle to the Temple, was used in the consecration of Joash (2 Kings 11:12). Disused and practically lost for a while, it was discovered and brought forth again in the reign of Josiah, B. C. 621, the reading of which promoted a revival (2 Kings 22:8). The earlier prophets were subsequently added to this collection, as indicated by the circumstance that the later prophets were acquainted with them and quoted from them (Dan. 9:2; Zech. 7:12).

Though the Temple was destroyed at the time of the captivity, B. C. 588, yet all the copies of the sacred books could not have been destroyed. Many such, doubtless, had been made for the kings (Deut. 17:18), and also for the schools of the prophets (2 Kings 2:3-5). Moreover, from these books the prophets quoted during the captivity (Dan. 9:2. 11-13), and finally after that event, the worship of the Jews was restored in accordance with their teachings (Ezra 6:18; Neh. 8).

In all probability the preparation of the Canon so-called, was begun at about this time. Prior to

the captivity it might be said that there was no need of a Canon or authorized declaration of the inspired books, because between the period of Moses and the captivity Israel had never been left without some living representative of God's presence and some revealer of his will. For example, the priests and prophets were the custodians of the revelation that had already come, and the latter particularly were the channel through which the revelation continued to come. Then also the Levites stationed at the convenient centers throughout the land instructed the people continually out of the books of the Law and in the history of God's dealings with them.

With the return from exile, however, a new state of things came into existence, and with the passing of Haggai and Zechariah there was no longer one who could say, "Thus saith the Lord," or whose interpretation of the Law would be received by all. The inspired books only remained, and by degrees, the returning exiles came to feel that none others need be expected and that on these only must their souls be nourished.

Ezra, it is thought, gave the earliest stimulus to religious inquiry of this kind, in which he was supported later by Nehemiah. See the books under their names, and consult also, the preface to the Apocryphal book, "Second Maccabees," in which Nehemiah is said to have "Founded a library into which he gathered books about the kings and the prophets and the books of David," alluding evident-

ly to the second and third divisions of the Old Testament. The Law, or the first division, had doubtless already been canonized, as we may gather from the books of Ezra and Nehemiah already referred to.

After the period of Ezra and Nehemiah, tradition holds that the completion of the Canon was carried forward by a company of scribes known as the "Great Synagogue," over which Ezra, himself. at first presided, and whose names are recorded probably in Nehemiah 10.

Of course it is not necessary to explain to the reader that this traditional view of the history of the Canon of the Old Testament, especially the Pentateuch or the Law, is disputed by certain critics. Their number is not large as compared with the great body of the church, but they are influential and can be heard a great ways. Consideration will be given to them in succeeding chapters.

CHAPTER VI.

WHY I BELIEVE MOSES WROTE THE PENTATEUCH.

WHY do I believe Moses wrote the Pentateuch or the first five books of the Law? This is the question I have been asking myself of late, and which I propose to answer in this chapter. I do this not because my opinion is of so much value to other people, but partly for my own satisfaction and partly because I believe that what will satisfy me will satisfy the average Christian, and it is for such I write.

1. I believe Moses wrote the Pentateuch because the whole Christian church and the whole Jewish nation have believed it, with fewest exceptions, during these past 3500 years; and these exceptions, for the most part, have been grouped together within a century. It is almost inconceivable that the Christian fathers and the leaders of the Jewish nation should have been so indifferent to this question, or so incapable of considering it, as never to have sifted it to the bottom; while on the other hand, living nearer its source they had better opportunities to do so than their successors in the present day.

2. I believe Moses wrote the Pentateuch be-

cause Jesus Christ believed it. Read his words in Mark 12:26, Luke 24:44, John 5:46, 47, and elsewhere. In these words he speaks of Moses, of Moses' writings, the book of Moses, the law of Moses, etc., and it is admitted by all the critics that in so doing he has in mind the Pentateuch as we have it today. Moreover, they admit that such was the understanding of his contemporaries, and of the hearers to whom he addressed these words. But they add, Jesus was himself mistaken! To be sure he was God, but in taking upon him our nature he did, as to that nature, so empty himself of his Godhead as to limit his capacity to know such things to that of his contemporaries.

You may not be ready to accept this, they say, and therefore we offer another hypothesis, viz: that Jesus may have been aware of the error of his contemporaries but felt himself under no obligation to correct it. I must leave it with my readers as to whether they are prepared to accept either of these hypotheses. As for myself, I am not. My knowledge of the Son of God, gathered from the Gospels, from the teachings of the Old Testament prophets, and from the effects of his life, death and resurrection in all these centuries will not permit me to believe that he was ignorant of the authorship of the Pentateuch, or that knowing it to be other than that of the man Moses, he failed to correct the prevailing error of his time and of all time.

3. I believe Moses wrote the Pentateuch because other Scriptures of the Old Testament bear

testimony to it. So frequent are these testimonies as to be quite familiar to every reader of the Bible, without quotation. The "Law," the "Book of the Law," the "Law of Moses," "The Book of the Law of Moses," how frequently we meet such references, what do they mean? "Oh," it is answered, "these allusions should be interpreted in accordance with custom. Anonymous books are frequently named after the chief character in them, as in the instances of Ruth and Esther, and this is all that can properly be claimed for the so-called law of Moses." But what if "the so-called law of Moses," unlike the books of Ruth and Esther, for example, does itself claim to have been written by Moses?

4. This brings me to the last argument by which I satisfy myself of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Read Exodus 17:14, 24:3, 4, 7, 34:27, Numbers 33:2, Deuteronomy 28:58-61, 31:9, 22, 26, etc. According to these statements Moses wrote the account of the battle with the Amalekites, he wrote all the words of the Lord received in the mount; he wrote the account of the journeyings of Israel, and he wrote all the words of the book of Deuteronomy including those of his song. Some of the critics say, "Yes, he wrote all these things to which his name is attached, but he did not write the rest of the Pentateuch." But if he wrote all these things, pray what was left, if we omit the book of Genesis?

Take Leviticus as an example. It has twenty-

seven chapters, but in these twenty-seven chapters Moses' name is mentioned fifty-four times in some such way as this, "And the Lord spake unto Moses." To be sure, it does not say Moses wrote all that the Lord thus spake unto him, but who would be more likely to write it, or who more competent? Let us then omit from the book of Leviticus all thus ascribed to Moses, and how much of its contents would remain? The same may be asked of Deuteronomy. Professor Bissell has estimated that about 940 words out of every 1000 in that book are intrinsically associated with its direct claim of Mosaic authorship.

And as to Genesis what shall we say? It contains no reference to Moses' name, but he who has ever read the Pentateuch as a whole must be impressed with its natural connection with that which follows. Moreover no historical evidence exists that it was ever separate from that which follows. Then, too, competent scholars tell us that the language of the whole Pentateuch is of a piece, i. e., it all belongs to the same period of Israel's history, the earliest period when the language was the purest and best. These things satisfy me, but we shall see in another chapter what the critics say concerning them.

CHAPTER VII.

WHY QUESTION THE MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH?

AFTER reading the last chapter some young beginner in the study has been led to ask, Why was the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch ever questioned? Well, I think the deep underlying motive that questioned it arose out of the repugnance of the natural heart to believe in a supernatural revelation from God. Mark you, I do not charge this upon all the critics, or believe that such a motive is present to all their minds, but the more one familiarizes himself with the subject the more is he impressed with the abstract fact itself.

The evolution theory of creation now in vogue is applied to the sacred Scriptures, and the critics say the Pentateuch is a growth, a development, corresponding to the growth and development of the nation of Israel itself. Their idea is that as need were felt for more legislation by that nation in the course of centuries, it was provided, and associated with the name of Moses to give it sanctity and persuasive force in the minds of the people.

Moses wrote the germ of the Pentateuch most of the critics will admit, but later writers, redactors, or editors they are sometimes called, devel-

oped these germs and added to them as the occasion called. Still later redactors again added to their work, and so on, until at length, somewhere about the time of Ezra, or a thousand years after Moses' death, the Pentateuch took on its present literary form. These redactors or editors, the more evangelical of the critics would say, were as divinely inspired for their work as Moses was for his, so that we may repose in the authority by which they spake as well as his.

Now all this sounds very simple and very reasonable, and we might well be prepared to believe it if it did not seem to flatly contradict what the Scriptures themselves say as quoted in the preceding chapter, and more; if it did not approach the danger point of deliberately charging those Scriptures with a pious fraud.

The case of Deuteronomy illustrates this. The critics boldly affirm that it was not written by Moses but by some priest or Levite in the period of King Josiah, B. C. 621; that it was the book supposed to have been found in the Temple as recorded in 2 Kings 22:10, but really prepared by Hilkiah himself perhaps, and palmed off upon the people as the work of Moses in order to stimulate them more heartily to the work of reform in that reign. What right-minded Christian does not shrink from such an imputation of literary forgery?

And what leads the critics to such an imputation? This, that there are differences in some respects between the legislation in Deuteronomy and that

in Leviticus, and that one seems to contradict the other. But a rational answer is that these laws were given on different occasions and for different ends. Leviticus was for the priests, Deuteronomy for the people, the nation at large. Moreover, Leviticus was given at Sinai, and Deuteronomy at Moab, with forty years between. When Leviticus was given the people were living in the wilderness, but when Deuteronomy was given they were about to enter on the settled life of Canaan. And, indeed, as the late Professor Green, of Princeton pointed out, some of the laws which on a cursory examination appear contradictory, will, on further reflection, prove to be supplemental.

The point of departure for the critics was somewhere about the eighteenth century when a French Roman Catholic physician, by the name of Jean Astruc, thought that he discovered the Pentateuch to be not an original production, but a compilation of earlier and differing documents. The thought was not altogether new with Astruc, for as early as the twelfth century a certain Jew, named Eben Ezea, called attention to it, and from time to time mention had been made of it by others; but Astruc was the first really to force it on the consideration of biblical scholars. He was soon followed by others, by Eichhorn, a German theologian of the same century, by Kuenen, Wellhausen, Canon Driver, Professor Briggs, and many more down to our own time, who have come to be known by the general title of "Higher Critics."

But we should not be misled by that word "Higher" as though it meant a superiority in scholarship or importance, which is not the case. The lower criticism deals with the text, examines the manuscripts and versions as we did, for example, in some of our earlier chapters, while the higher criticism takes the text thus examined and seeks to discover its source and history. Some one suggests that the "Further Criticism" or the "Historical Criticism" would better indicate its chief aim and result.

The first thing that fastened itself on the attention of Astruc and his predecessors was a difference in the names of God recorded in Genesis. In the Hebrew we sometimes meet with Elohim, "God," and sometimes with Jehovah Elohim, "Lord God," from which has arisen the hypothesis of an "Elohistic" document and a "Jehovistic" document with different authors. These authors are sought to be traced through all the books of the Pentateuch, and latterly in Joshua. Other dislocations have followed this until now by some, the whole of Genesis has been reduced to legend; the Hebrew religion has sprung from Babylonian mythology; the patriarchs are myths; Jacob's sons are the twelve signs of the Zodiac. Saul and Jonathan are the constellation Gemini; David is a solar hero; and other extravagances are almost without end. We can not pursue the subject further now, but in the next chapter we shall see something of what may be said on the other side.

CHAPTER VIII.
ANSWERING THE CRITICS.

A PRIMER of the faith can hardly be expected to state, much less answer, all the objections of the critics, but one or two replies may be hinted at as a kind of sample of the rest.

For example, take the question of the different names of the Deity as suggesting different documents and authors. Why should not the critics take the rational, not to say the reverent view, that God may have revealed these different names of himself to express the different relationships he sustains to his intelligent creatures? "Elohim" stands for God as Creator and Lord of the universe, but "Jehovah" stands for him as the Covenant-keeping God, the God of redemption especially, the God of his own people.

It is true that the one Name is used in the first chapter of Genesis and in the first or outline account of creation, and the other in the second chapter which gives the same account in detail; but may not these two accounts, (if they be two indeed), have been brought together by the one inspired pen for the sake of their combined lesson? And what is that lesson? It is that Elohim is Jehovah, and Jehovah is Elohim. The God who

made Heaven and earth is no mere tutelary God like those of the nations round about, but omnipotent and supreme, and this God is, in a peculiar sense, the God of Israel, his chosen nation. Is not this a lesson worthy of the bringing together of two such documents by the one hand, and worthy indeed of the employment of the two names in the one account? Moreover, as others have pointed out, this theory of the two names of God, identifying two documents and two human authors, to be credited must be consistent, but it is not consistent. "Elohim" is found in the so-called Jehovistic documents and "Jehovah" in the so-called Elohistic, and this not merely once or twice but many times. What do the critics say to this? O, only, that the text is corrupt, or that the redactor made a mistake!

Now as to the question of the documents themselves, no thinking person will dogmatically deny that Moses may have gathered some of his information recorded in the book of Genesis in this way. The art of writing was known and literature highly cultivated thousands of years before he was born,and the great cities of patriarchal times and earlier, had libraries like the great cities of today. Tradition had handed down stories of the creation, of the fall, of the deluge, of the nations, of the earlier periods of Israel, why should not Moses have had access to these authorities the same as any other historian of that or any other time? Would this affect the question of his divine inspira-

tion? Certainly not, for one may as truly be inspired to compile, (and to sift out truth from error as he compiles), as to write down a revelation fresh from the throne of God.

Let any one compare the record of Moses in the book of Genesis with the legendary and mythological accretions on the same subjects in contemporaneous writings, and he will have little difficulty in recognizing the divine guidance by which he was "led through the realms of fable into the region of truth."

And then again, it may be readily granted to the critics that Moses did not write every word of the Pentateuch as we now possess it. It is not vital to its Mosaic authorship to insist on this. Some other hand may have added the record of his own death, for example, just as there are indications of editorial comment in other places. (See Genesis 13:7, 36:31, Exodus 16:35, and Leviticus 18:28, for examples.) Sometimes modern names of places, i. e., modern as compared with the period of Moses, are found in the text, and it is perfectly supposable, that they may have been added, or the earlier names altered by a later hand. Ezra may have done this after the captivity in connection with that reading and interpreting of the law mentioned in the book of Nehemiah (8); "but however this may have been, the isolated phrases can not be suffered to weigh against the abundant evidence for the earlier origin of the book that contains them."

There is, of course, very much more that might be said in answer to the critics. One argument against their position which has always had great weight with me is the fact that the nation of Israel would have been without a literature for the first several centuries of its history if their hypothesis be correct. Place the origin of the Pentateuch, or the major part of it away up in the days of the kings or farther, and what did Israel possess before that in the way of national writings? Nothing whatever. Here is an argument that has gained force of late since archaelogical research has demonstrated beyond a doubt the great literary activity of contemporaneous nations. If Israel were an unintelligent people at the beginning this might not apply, but we know the opposite to have been the case.

And then again, is the corresponding fact that Moses was competent to write the Pentateuch. Learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians was he as few other men of his age. "Egyptian learning was carefully concealed from foreigners," remarked Dr. S. G. Green, "the priests and the royal family alone having access to it; but to this class must the writer of the Pentateuch have belonged" as judged by a critical examination of its contents; and yet he must have been a Hebrew speaking the language and cherishing the sentiments of his nation. Who fits this condition of things except Moses?

We wish space and time afforded the opportunity to go further into the internal evidence of the

Mosaic authorship. We should like to speak of the references to Egyptian life many of which were formerly alleged to be incorrect, but are now demonstrated to be true, and true particularly of the time of Moses, but we close with this quotation from the Bible Hand-book (revised edition page 403):—

"Add to this that Judaism is founded upon the supposed truthfulness of these records. If there be a forgery, when could it have been executed? Not when the Septuagint was made (B. C. 285). Not on the return from Babylon (B. C. 536). Not on the division of the kingdom (B. C. 975). Not in the days of Samuel (B. C. 1095). Not in the four hundred years preceding. For in each successive era there were thousands interested in detecting the forgery and setting aside the burdensome institutions founded upon it. To suppose any man could secure the observance of these things on the plea that they had been observed from the first, and for the reasons assigned, when it must have been known that this statement was untrue, is to suppose a greater miracle than any the record contains." A greater miracle, I may add, than to suppose that Moses wrote the Pentateuch.

CHAPTER IX.

THE EARLY HISTORICAL BOOKS.

WE have given all the time we can profitably spare to the consideration of the canon of the Law and must now proceed to the second division of the Old Testament, the Prophets. This, as was stated earlier, is sometimes divided into the Former and Latter Prophets, the "Former" including Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, but which are better known to us perhaps, as the early Historical books. These, too, are passing through the crucible of modern literary criticism, although much less is being said and heard about them than the Pentateuch.

Tradition names Joshua as the author of the first book, and, from the common sense point of view, that much of its contents could have been known only to himself or to whomsoever he revealed it. In evidence of this see 1:1, 3:7, 5:13, etc. To this fact should be added the further one that the vividness of the descriptions throughout the book indicate the presence of an eye-witness, a suggestion strengthened by the occasional use of the pronouns "We" and "Us," as, for example, 5:1-6. And then, too, there is an express statement that Joshua made a record "in the book of the Law of God"

(24:26). There is indeed a common expression in the book, "unto this day," (4:9, 6:25, 8:28), indicating a later hand than Joshua, but in explanation of this the same thing may be said as in the case of the Pentateuch, viz: that while the book was really written by Joshua a subsequent editor gave to it its present literary form. Of course, it might be perfectly satisfactory to say that Joshua added these comments himself towards the close of his life, but even then we have to account for the record of his death (24), which Samuel or some later prophet must have contributed. But no matter whose hand contributed these later allusions it may be safely argued that it was prior to the period of David and Solomon, for the proof of which compare Joshua 15:63 with 2 Samuel 5:7-9, and Joshua 16:10 with 1 Kings 9:16.

But let it not be supposed for a moment that the question of the authorship of every word in the book is necessarily bound up with that of its inspiration or its authority. One man may be guided by the Holy Spirit to write a book up to a certain point in time and another to complete it, a thought upon which more light shall be thrown when we reach Part III. of our work dealing with inspiration; but in the meantime as to the authority of this book let it be remembered what was said in our earlier chapters as to the genuineness of the Old Testament as a whole. Every book, including Joshua as we now have it, was contained in the Septuagint, used by Christ and his apostles, and

acknowledged by the whole Jewish nation as canonical. Particular references to Joshua, establishing its authority, are found in 1 Kings 16:34, Habakkuk 3:11, Acts 7:45, Hebrews 9:30, and James 2:25.

The book of Judges is thus called from the fact that it gave the history of judges who governed Israel from the time of Joshua to the monarchy a period of between three and four hundred years or thereabouts. Its authorship, though unknown definitely, is usually ascribed to Samuel for the following reasons:

(1) It was written after the establishment of the monarchy (19:1, 21:25).

(2) It was written prior to the capture of Jerusalem (1:21).

(3) Jerusalem was captured by David (2 Samuel 5:6-8).

(4) It must have been written therefore during Saul's reign.

(5) The most probable author during that reign was Samuel.

To be sure there is a captivity of Israel referred to in chapter 18:30, from which some would argue a date for the book as late as Ezra; but it is to be remembered that there were several captivities of Israel, or at least of certain tribes of Israel, prior to that at the hand of the Assyrians about 720 B. C., and it may be to one of these the author refers. Indeed the main purpose of the book seems to be to tell about these captivities, how they came about

and how Israel was delivered from them. Compare for a similar mention of early captivities, Psalm 79:60, 61, etc. But in any event, no matter who was the human writer or compiler of the book its authority for us is established beyond question by the arguments used in the case of Joshua, and its quotation in other Scriptures, as for example, Samuel 12:9-12, 2 Samuel 11:21, Psalm 83:11, Isaiah 9:4, Acts 13:20, Hebrews 11:32 and elsewhere.

To follow the Jewish classification the book of Ruth should be considered later in connection with the third division of the Old Testament known as the "Holy Writings," but its proximity to Judges and the natural relationship it bears to that book will make it more convenient to speak of it at this time. That relationship is marked by the very first sentence, and indeed the very first word of the book which, in the Revised Version, is "And." Its authorship is, like Judges, ascribed to Samuel, and in any event it was written "after the period of the judges when certain Israelitish usages had become antiquated, and probably when David's house was established upon the throne." See for these things, 1:1, 4:7, and 4:17-22. Quoting the Bible Hand-book in this place, "a chief design of this book is to trace the descent of David, bringing out clearly the fact that a foreigner, one of a hated race, was in the ancestral line. In this connection read also Matthew 1:5, where the further fact is added that Boaz, the husband of Ruth, was a de-

scendant of Rahab. Thus does the purpose of Jehovah show itself superior to positive command (Deuteronomy 23:3), while the facts expressly indicate the catholicity of the divine kingdom, and prefigure the calling of the Gentiles."

This is a good place to notice, although it might have been stated earlier, that the books of the Old Testament in the Jewish canon numbered but twenty-four, while with us they number thirty-nine; but this is because the following were reckoned by the Jews as one book each—1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, the twelve Minor Prophets.

As to 1 and 2 Samuel tradition ascribes their writing to the prophet himself down to 1 Samuel 24, and the remainder to Nathan or Gad who were his contemporaries (1 Samuel 10:25, 1 Chronicles 29:29). The authority of these books, like the preceding ones, is established by numerous quotations in other books of the New and Old Testaments which the reader may easily discover by the examination of the marginal references in his Bible.

Jeremiah has been regarded as the compiler of the two books of Kings, although it is a point on which there is no absolute certainty. I speak of him as compiler rather than author, however, because there are many indications in the books as to the sources which may have been used in their composition. See 1 Kings 11:41, 14:19, 14:29, and other places. Some of these sources thus referred

to may have been the court records of the different kings, and some of them may have been the memoirs of the prophets of the time, such as Elijah and Elisha, which had been preserved in the schools of the prophets of which mention is made in the book.

CHAPTER X.

TWO ISAIAHS, OR ONE?

THE Jewish classification of the "Prophets," as we have seen, was that of "Former" and "Latter;" but as in our last chapter we ventured to change the designation of the "Former" into that of the "Early Historical Books," to agree with our modern nomenclature, so in this we shall describe the "Latter" prophets by the more customary division of our time, the "Major and Minor Prophets."

The Major prophets include the first four, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel, and the Minor all the rest. These first four are called "Major," however, not because of their greater authority or importance as revelations from God, but because of their greater length. Of these there are only two, the first and the last, Isaiah and Daniel, that have drawn the serious attacks of the critics, and to which it may be necessary for us to give more than cursory reference.

Isaiah who is in some respects the greatest of all the prophets, began to prophesy in the last year of the reign of Uzziah, King of Judah, (Isaiah 6), and continued throughout the reigns of his suc-

cessors Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah (Isaiah 1). He was, like Daniel, probably a statesman as well as a prophet, for we find him repeatedly speaking and acting in connection with public affairs (see chapters 7 and 8 for a conspicuous example). His name means, "Salvation of Jehovah," and he has commonly been called the Evangelical prophet because his writings deal so much with the Person and Work of the Messiah, the Savior of the world.

He has the distinction, too, of being quoted by Christ and his apostles more than any other of the prophets.

His book naturally divides itself into two main portions, part one including the first thirty-nine chapters, and part two the remaining twenty-seven. Part one contains prophetic addresses and warnings of different dates, many of them bearing on the present duty and welfare of the Jewish nation, and some relating to the Gentile nations of the period; but part two differs in being a kind of continuous prophetic discourse of which the starting-point is the Babylonian captivity predicted in the last chapter of part one.

The leading theme of part two is the deliverance from this captivity, but no one can read it carefully, especially in the light of other Scriptures, without perceiving that the prophet has in mind a still greater deliverance than that from Babylon, even the one spoken of by all the prophets, when the Messiah shall come "a second time without sin

unto salvation," and God's kingdom shall be indeed set up upon the earth with Israel at its head. Thus the whole of part two has been called by some the "Rhapsody of Redemption."

Now, mainly because of this great difference between the two parts of the book, some modern critics have held that the latter part was the work of a later prophet, a second, or "Deutero-Isaiah," who wrote during the capitivity, and to their arguments we must now give some attention. As already intimated, "the main problem lies in the change of place, time and situation which confronts us in chapter 40. The final prophecy of part one is uttered against Sennacherib about 701 B. C., but the opening one of part two seems addressed to the captives in Babylon in the later years of their exile, say 598-550."

But why, we may ask, should not this be so? Is it not customary for prophets to be carried forward in vision even further than that? Moses in Deuteronomy 28, sweeps the horizon of 3500 years and this second Isaiah, if, for the moment, we shall designate him thus, covers at least 700 years in chapter 53, unless we are prepared to deny its application to the suffering Savior.

There is a great difference in style between the parts, say the critics; but may not the great difference in style be explained by the great difference in subject? Is there any greater difference in the style of the two parts than there is between a literary essay and a state paper of John Milton?

It has been discovered also that there are Chaldaisms in part two, i. e., words or expressions foreign to the Hebrew tongue and indicating an acquaintance with that of Babylon as if the writer must have been living there instead of Judea, but closer investigation of part one reveals their presence there as well as in part two, so that this particular argument becomes a kind of boomerang and proves more than is desired.

The mention of the name of Cyrus, King of Persia, some two hundred years before his birth (chapters 44, 45), is used as an argument for a later author of part two, on the ground that it is unlike the usual scope of prophecy to do this. But there is a precedent for that in the case of Josiah (1 Kings 13:2), who is named 300 years before he saw the light of day. Jehovah said he knew and aided Jeremiah before his conception (Jeremiah 1), and why not Cyrus? The whole question, indeed, resolves itself into what we may understand by the words "prophet" and "prophecy" and how much latitude we shall permit the source of inspiration in the exercise of that power.

Nor is this last remark an attempt to ridicule the critics as if they were not of the same mind with us in regard to it. They would admit as readily as we, where they admit the supernatural at all, that God is able to reveal anything he wills to reveal and that the question of its character or its period of fulfillment is not before us. But does

God will to reveal this or that is the question? Did he reveal the name of Cyrus to Isaiah 200 years before his birth, or did a second and later Isaiah write these things about him after the event? All the arguments already presented are in favor of the generally accepted view, but there is yet one which is still stronger; one which throws divine light upon the very meaning and purpose of prophecy itself.

I refer to the appeals which God himself makes to the fulfillments of his earlier declarations as a proof of his claim to know the end from the beginning. Should one desire to look into this more particularly I would recommend to him Professor Margoliouth's, "Lines of Defense of the Biblical Revelation," but in the meantime let him examine and compare for himself in this book of Isaiah chapters 41:21-26, 43:9-13, 44:7, 8, 45:19-21, 46:9-11, 47:3-8.

It will be seen that in all these places God is challenging his enemies as to himself by the truth of the predictions to which he has given utterance by the prophets. But as another truly says, if these predictions were simply "prophecies after the event," his challenge fails.

The application to the case of Cyrus and its bearing on the question of two Isaiahs, therefore, is very plain. God is in the habit, if one may so say, of predicting things before they come to pass in order that their fulfillment may prove his existence, his truthfulness and power. Why, then, should not he have spoken these things about

Cyrus in such a manner, and why should any one feel necessitated to take up the position of the critics to the contrary? There is still more, indeed, to be said upon this subject, but we will reserve it for another chapter.

CHAPTER XI.

THE OTHER MAJOR PROPHETS.

IN chapter 10 we considered the argument for one Isaiah rather than two merely from the negative point of view, i. e., we took up some of the objections to a single author and the replies that might be made to them. But before addressing ourselves to the other Major prophets there is something more to be said from the positive point of view.

For example, the synthetic reading of Isaiah impresses one with its unity, and gives no suggestion of the break at chapter 40, which the critics magnify. Then again, there is only one superscription or introduction to the book, that at the beginning, which in the nature of the case seems to include the whole. Did a second writer come into view at chapter 40, we should naturally expect a second introduction suggestive of it.

Then there are other internal evidences of unity, for example, peculiar words or phrases common alike to both sections. Take the title of Jehovah in Isaiah, "The Holy One of Israel," which is used but thirty times in the whole of the Old Testament, and twenty-five of them in this book. The query at once arises whether it is found in both parts of the book? If it is it becomes a striking testimony

to the oneness of authorship of both parts. But as a matter of fact it is not only found in both parts, but as evenly as possible divided between them, twelve times in one part, and thirteen in the other! Furthermore, as many writers have pointed out, the local coloring of part two is as thoroughly Judaic as that of part one; the rocks, and the mountains, the valley streams, the flocks and herds belong to Judah and do not belong to Babylon.

And then finally, added to this internal evidence is the historic which should ever be kept in view, and which we have applied from time to time to all the books, viz:—the fact that neither the Jewish nation on the one hand, or the Christian church on the other has ever known of more than one Isaiah. Christ and his apostles never mentioned more than one, and although he and they quoted from both parts of the book many times, there is not the slightest intimation on any occasion that they were not always dealing with one and the same author. Thus much for Isaiah.

To pass now to Jeremiah, we have to deal with a prophet as to whose personal history we know more than in the case of any other, and one concerning whom the critics have but little to say. He follows Isaiah about three quarters of a century, and was called to the prophetic office in the reign of Josiah, and while he was still very young. His native place was Anathoth (chapter 1), from which he was driven by persecution (11), when, coming

to Jerusalem, he entered upon a still more strenuous life to which there was little "let up" until the end of his career.

His work in Jerusalem divides itself into four parts chiefly, viz:—the reigns of Josiah, Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, and the period of the remnant left by Nebuchadnezzar after the captivity. By this remnant he was subsequently carried against his will into Egypt where, presumably, his life closed.

"His history brings before us a man forced as it were, in spite of himself, from obscurity and retirement into publicity and peril. Naturally mild, susceptible and inclined rather to mourn in secret for the iniquity which surrounded him than to brave and denounce the wrong-doers, he stood forth at the call of God, and proved himself a faithful, fearless champion of the truth, amidst reproaches, insults and threats. This combination of qualities is so marked, that it has well been regarded as a proof of the divine origin of his mission."

His prophecies are not arranged in chronological order in his book for some reason difficult to determine, but the chiefest among them are those in which he predicts the dominance of Babylon (27), the period of seventy years captivity of Judah (25), the return to Jerusalem (29), the coming of the Messiah (23), the final abrogation of the Mosaic law (3), the Gospel dispensation, and finally that of the Millennium (31). His authority is abundantly sustained by quotations in other parts of the Bible, and especially in the New Testament, for

which, as in other instances, the reader is referred to the marginal notes of his Bible.

The book of Lamentations follows Jeremiah and although it was classed by the Jews among the "Holy Writings" rather than the "Prophets," yet for convenience it will be dealt with here as in the case of Ruth and the book of Judges. Although it does not contain the name of Jeremiah it has always been attributed to him without successful contradiction as far as I am aware. To quote the Bible Hand-book, "The book expresses with pathetic tenderness the prophet's grief for the desolation of the city and the temple of Jerusalem, the captivity of the people, the miseries of famine, the cessation of public worship, and the other calamities with which his countrymen had been afflicted for their sins. The leading object was to teach the suffering Jews neither to despise 'the chastening of the Lord' nor to 'faint' when 'rebuked of him,' but to turn to God with deep repentance, to confess their sins, and humbly look to him alone for pardon and deliverance. The book consists of five chapters, each being a separate, complete poem."

Ezekiel, like Jeremiah, was a priest as well as a prophet, although neither seems to have served in that capacity. He was carried captive into Babylon during the reign of Jehoiachin, about ten years before the destruction of Jerusalem, and prophesied from that place contemporaneously with Jeremiah in Judea.

There seem to be four natural divisions of the book, as follows:—1-24; 25-32; 33-39; 40-48.

The first consists of prophecies of the usual character in strict chronological order, up until the final destruction of Jerusalem. The nation is charged with sin, and, in perfect agreement with the teachings of Jeremiah, is shown the hopelessness of every effort to shake off the Babylonish yoke, especially through any confederacy with Egypt. The second part is, in a sense, parenthetic, and consists of discourses against the nations. These are not grouped chronologically perhaps, but in accordance with a kind of moral unity. The third part is related to Israel again, and is composed of discourses uttered after the destruction of Jerusalem. Like all the preceding prophets, Ezekiel in these discourses speaks chiefly of mercy, salvation and ultimate blessing and triumph for his people. Part four, which really belongs to part three perhaps, shows the return of the glory of God to the land, and the re-establishment of the sanctuary and the twelve-tribed nationality in the latter days, or rather in the coming age.—(Synthetic Bible Studies.)

The consideration of Daniel must be postponed to another chapter.

CHAPTER XII.

"DANIEL IN THE CRITIC'S DEN."

THE euphonious and somewhat facetious title at the head of this chapter is that of Sir Robert Anderson's book on the authenticity of Daniel, and while I have not read it, yet if it approximates the standard of his other works, and I believe it does, every Christian not otherwise equipped for the defense of Daniel, might well become possessed of its contents.

And every active Christian should be so equipped. There is no book of the Old Testament, hardly, excepting the Pentateuch, which the destructive critics so desire to abolish as Daniel. Grant the prophetic character of certain of its chapters, and there is enough of the supernatural in them to carry with it all the evidence desired for the divine revelation of the rest of the Bible. Sir Isaac Newton said, that, to reject Daniel's prophecies was to reject the Christian religion, which is founded on his prophecy concerning Christ. Westcott qualifies this only a little when he says, that "no writing of the Old Testament had so great an influence in the development of Christianity as the book of Daniel."

Daniel was of the tribe of Judah and probably of the royal blood (chapter 1:3-6). He was carried

captive into Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar some time before Ezekiel, and in the reign of Jehoiakim, and was there trained and qualified for service at the court, attaining a wisdom far superior to the native men of science, and for this reason raised to a dignity of highest rank and power, which he retained, although not interruptedly, through the whole of the dynasties both of Babylon and Persia its successor. He prophesied throughout the captivity. His book was originally classed by the Jews among the "Holy Writings," as we have seen, but we prefer to treat of it in the present connection for the reasons indicated in the case of certain other books mentioned.

I quote here a few isolated sentences from Nathaniel West's preface to his valuable work entitled, "Daniel's Great Prophecy:"—

"The book of Daniel was written to prefigure, in outline, the course of history from the Babylonian exile to the second coming of Christ, and to reveal the age of millennial glory following that event. It consists of twelve chapters, of which five are historical, 1, 3-6, and seven prophetical, 2, 7-12, the predictions setting forth, by means of symbols and their interpretation, the political and religious struggles of the Jews with the empires of the world with greater clearness than in any other prophet. The labor done in the critical and exegetical study of the book has been very great, but it still remains an anvil on which all hammers are shattered."

The destructive critics have sought to show that

certain of its predictions, those in chapters 7 and 8, for example, having a primary fulfilment in the period of Antiochus Epiphanes, King of Syria, B. C. 170, were written after the event, and somewhere in the times of the Maccabees, 168-164, but the effort falls to the ground. One may be quite ready to admit a Maccabean editorship as a similar editorship has been admitted in the case of other books, but this is far from saying that the book is of Maccabean authorship, or even any considerable part of it.

But let us consider in detail some of the objections raised to its genuineness or at least to its genuineness as a whole.

In the first place, the main interest of the predictive portion of the book beginning at chapter 7, centers in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, B. C. 170, and it is suggested that the analogy of other prophetic writings would lead us to suppose that here was the writer's historical standpoint. If he wrote as a captive in Babylon, as we know Daniel to have been, it is strange that he subordinates the needs and hopes of his own generation to those of posterity (S. C. Green). But to this it may be replied that such is not unusual with the prophets. Isaiah, indeed, does not detach himself from contemporaneous history in the way that Daniel does, but is he not almost equally minute in picturing the distant future? And what about Christ's prophecy in the twenty-fourth of Matthew? He de-

taches himself as much as Daniel does and pictures the distant future with even greater fulness.

Another objection is that some of the historical references in the first six chapters are difficult to reconcile with the results of modern discoveries concerning the Persia or Babylon of Daniel's day. But this is denied by scholars of equal eminence on the other side, like Lenormant, for example, who says that, "whoever is not the slave of preconceived opinions, denying the supernatural, must confess when comparing the chapters with the cuneiform monuments, that they are really ancient, and written at but a short distance from the events themselves."

Linguistic difficulties are emphasized. There are Greek words in Daniel which suggest a later authorship, it is said. These words are the names of the musical instruments mentioned in the earlier chapters, but Professor Margoliouth, of Oxford, shows that there are Greek words in Isaiah 40, written a long while before Daniel, and that Greek words were borrowed by the Eastern nations as early as the 8th century B. C. There are some scholars who contend also, that it is quite as likely that Greece borrowed the names of these instruments from Babylon as that the latter borrowed them from Greece.

A fourth criticism is that there is no mention made of Daniel in the roll of famous men in Ecclesiasticus, an Apocryphal book of about 200 B. C., but as Margoliouth points out in his "Lines

of Defence of the Biblical Revelation," neither does the writer of that book mention Ezra although he names Nehemiah. The destruction of one link, therefore, destroys the whole chain. Moreover the same writer brings forth other arguments too lengthy and intricate to quote here, which, if they are not in themselves sufficient to prove Daniel genuine do at least "wreck the theories that are at present dominant." (pp. 175 et seq.)

Space will not permit the prolongation of this subject, nor is it necessary for the class of readers to which these pages are addressed; but should one desire to consider it still further, he will find help in Kitto's Biblical Cyclopedia, article, "Daniel," in Pusey's lectures on that book, and in the "Introductions" in the Speaker's and Lange's Commentaries upon it.

It should be remarked before closing, however, that other parts of the Bible abundantly corroborate the genuineness of Daniel. References to it are found in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Zechariah in the Old Testament, and in 1 Corinthians 6:2, Thessalonians 2:4, and Hebrews 11:33-34 in the New Testament. Christ quotes the prophet by name in Matthew 24:15, and it is very evident to any reader of the two books that much of the symbolism of Revelation is clearly related to it. Speaking of Christ's reference to it, Dr. West says, "I hold it to be unassailable that our Lord had the whole book of Daniel, and especially the vision of judg-

ment (7) directly in his mind when he uttered his great Olivet discourse concerning the end."

"When, therefore, the opposers assail these predictions as apocryphal for the sake of maintaining their working rule, we can reply to them that they assail Christ himself and usurp his place as the interpreter of prophecy and the Heaven-sent Teacher of the Church."

CHAPTER XIII.

THE MINOR PROPHETS.

THE twelve Minor Prophets may be classified as pre- and post-exilic. Those who prophesied before the exile were Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habbakuk and Zephaniah; and those after that event, Haggai, Zachariah and Malachi. Of the first names, another classification may be made, as follows:—

1. Those who prophesied in Israel.
2. Those who prophesied in Judah.
3. Those who, while belonging to Israel or Judah, had a message only to a Gentile nation.

To the first of these latter classes belong Hosea, Amos and Micah, concerning each of whom a few words must suffice. Although Hosea comes first in the Bible, yet Amos preceded him in time, prophesying in the reign of Jeroboam II. (1:1). Glimpses of his personal history are found in chapters 3 and 7. He was by profession a herdsman and gatherer of sycamore fruit, not being trained to the prophetic office, but called to it by an irresistible divine impulse. He speaks of himself as the author of his own book (7 and 8:1-2), whose canonicity is attested by Acts 7:42-43 and 15:15-17.

Hosea, while contemporaneous with Amos for a while, prophesied to a still later period, even down

to the captivity. Peculiar interest attaches to his book by reason of the impassioned tenderness of his utterances (or rather Jehovah's utterances through him), to a wicked and idolatrous people, intensified by his own bitter domestic experience growing out of his relations with an adulterous wife. For New Testament citations attesting the authority of the book, consult the marginal references in your Bible; for example, Matthew 2:15, 9:13, 12:7; Romans 9:25-26; 1 Corinthians 15:55; 1 Peter 2:10, etc.

Micah, who speaks of himself as a Morasthite, or a native of Moreshethgath, a town twenty miles southwest of Jerusalem, was a contemporary of Hosea, and for that matter, of Isaiah also, since he includes Judah as well as Israel in his ministry (1:1). There is an interesting reference to him in Jeremiah 27:10-19, and he is quoted by other of the prophets, Zephaniah 3:19, Ezekiel 22:27 and Isaiah 41:15.

There is one passage in his book, chapter 4:1-3. similar to Isaiah 2:2-4, which presumably was not borrowed by either prophet from the other, but may have been a prediction of an earlier time employed by both as a kind of text. Such correspondences are not unusual among the prophets, and suggest that certain phraseology may have been a common language among them. For the general contents of this book and its teachings, as in the case of the other prophets, the reader is referred to the author's work, "Synthetic Bible Studies."

To the second of these latter classes belong Joel, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah. The evidence that Joel prophesied in Judah, however, is only indirect, as, for example, (a), he makes no reference to Israel, but (b), does refer to Jerusalem, the temple, etc., indicating familiarity with Judah, (1:13-14, 2:17, etc.). He is probably the earliest of all prophets except Jonah, a fact which seems to be shown by the circumstance that he mentions none of Judah's later enemies like Assyria and Babylon, but does mention the earlier ones, Philistia, Phoenicia, Edom, etc. He seems to have lived at a time antedating the extreme depravity of his people, since he makes no mention of idolatry, and since the temple service, as will be seen, was in a flourishing condition. He, too, is attested by one very striking passage in the New Testament—that used of the day of Pentecost, Acts 2:16-21. See also Romans 10:13 and Revelation 9:7-9.

Habbakuk and Zephaniah were contemporaries of Jeremiah. The evidence of this in the case of the former is seen in that he does not speak of Assyria, which presumably had been overcome, while he refers very especially to the increase of Chaldea or Babylon. He foretells the destruction of that power. The evidence of the same fact in the case of Zephaniah is seen in chapter 1:1, which speaks of his prophesying "in the days of Josiah" (compare Jeremiah 1:2), but of his personal history nothing further is known. It is this prophet that

furnishes the text for that great mediaeval poem "Dies Irae,"—"the day of wrath." (1:15-18).

The third includes Jonah, Nahum and Obadiah. The first named seems to have been the immediate successor of Elisha in Israel, although the message of his book is entirely taken up with the history of Nineveh the capitol of Assyria. His prophecies in Israel seem to have been confined to the single one mentioned in 2 Kings 14:25. No prophet of the Old Testament next to Daniel and Isaiah has received so much attention from the critic of the supernatural in the Bible, and therefore we shall reserve any further consideration of his book to a separate chapter.

Nahum, like Jonah, prophesied against Nineveh (or Assyria) probably a hundred years later, or about the date of Isaiah. Nothing is known of his personal history beyond reference to his birthplace (1:1), which now is unknown. A passage in chapter 1:15, used also in Isaiah 52:7, illustrates what was said before concerning a common inheritance of the prophets in certain phraseology. Obadiah prophesied against the Edomites, who, with the Assyrians and Babylonians were the bitterest foes of Israel in those days, and, who, away back in the time of their wilderness wanderings, treated them with peculiar cruelty. There are no quotations from Obadiah in the New Testament.

Coming now to the consideration of the three post-exilic prophets, it is to be remembered that Haggai and Zechariah were contemporaneous with

Zerubbabel, the first governor of the returned colony, and doubtless also with Ezra. Their mission was to incite the Jews to rebuild the temple after the restoration, although like all the prophets of the earlier periods, their predictions extend nevertheless to the remotest time, to the introduction of the Millennial Age. Haggai is attested by Ezra 5:1, and 6:14, and, in the New Testament, in a very remarkable reference in Hebrews 12:26. Zechariah is more frequently referred to in the New Testament. There is some question as to the genuineness of the second half of his book, to which reference may be made more particularly in the next chapter.

Malachi closes the canon of the Old Testament and forms the connecting link with the New. He was doubtless contemporaneous with Nehemiah, whom he assisted in the execution of his later national reforms. The evidence of his date is found in the fact that the temple seems to have been restored (1:10, 3:1-10), and that he censures the same abuses as Nehemiah. (Compare his prophecies with Nehemiah 13:5-30, especially). He has many attestations in the New Testament, as may be seen by a study of the marginal references.

CHAPTER XIV.

IS JONAH HISTORIC?

IN THE preceding chapter a further word was promised concerning Zechariah before treating of the prophet Jonah, the reason for which was that some critics hold to two authors in that book as in Isaiah, the dividing line following chapter 8. The style of the latter half of the book is as different from the first as in the case of the other prophet. Moreover, the evangelist Matthew (27:9, 10), ascribes Zechariah 11:13 to Jeremiah. This latter apparent discrepancy may be explained by what was said in an earlier chapter about various readings and the errors of copyists; and as to the difference in style, what was said in our treatment of Isaiah applies. Zechariah may have varied his style according to his subject, and those who remember the present writer's treatment of this book in "Synthetic Bible Studies," will recall the great difference in subject between the first part and the last. In the first, the prophet's mind rests mainly on the re-building of the temple after the captivity and the re-establishment of the Jewish state at that time, while in the last, he is treating of Millennial conditions for the most part. Then, too, there is only one introduction to the book as in Isaiah's case.

However, when all is said in favor of a single

author, it is still well to keep in mind the words of an old puritan divine that the latter chapters being joined to the prophecies of Zechariah, proves no more that they are his than the like joining of Agur's proverbs to those of Solomon proves that they are Solomon's, or that all the Psalms are David's because they are in the book with his. I do not quite agree with this because in the case of Proverbs, Agur's name is mentioned as an author which is not the case here, but I give the quotation for what it is worth.

One thing we do know, however, that whether there were two authors or one, the New Testament quotes both parts of the book as alike authoritative and divine, as may be seen by even a cursory comparison of the marginal references. It is interesting to note, too, that next to Isaiah no Old Testament prophet contains so many foreshadowings of the Person and work of our Lord as Zechariah. We do not undervalue the importance of knowing the human authorship of each of these books, and as we have already seen, in some cases the testimony to this authorship is closely related to that of the authority and infallibility of the Bible itself, but it is not so in every instance. Nor is it in the present one, and we should be careful not to give the opponent of the truth the advantage of using such an argument against us.

The late D. L. Moody once said at Northfield, in his hard common sense way, that it was "more important to know what Isaiah said than how many

Isaiah's said it," a remark which has a wider application than to that particular prophet. For myself, I always go back in the last analysis to Jesus Christ. A Bible that he believed in and used is a good enough Bible for me. Was the Zechariah of the twentieth century that of the first? Was Jesus Christ affected by the question whether it had two authors or one? Were any of the apostles in doubt on this point? All these questions were, I trust, satisfactorily answered in the preceding chapters, and while as we now go into details as to some of them for the sake of broader information, let us rest our faith nevertheless on the main postulates which were there seen to be established.

And now as to Jonah. There is only a single reference to any prophesying of Jonah in connection with his own people, and that is found in 2 Kings 14:25. It is a prediction he had made concerning the restoration of the coasts of Israel fulfilled in the reign of Jeroboam II. somewhere about 800 B. C., showing that Jonah must have flourished at an earlier date, though how much earlier, no one knows. Of his personal history nothing more can be told than that recorded in the same verse with the exception of what we find in his book.

That book contains the record of his special mission to the great Gentile city of Nineveh, the Assyrian capital, a story as familiar as that of any of the old patriarchs. Every one knows how Jonah refused to comply with the divine command, the punishment which befell him, the repentance which

followed, his subsequent obedience and the result of his commission both on Nineveh and on himself.

Of course, the question will not down, Is this historic? And this is asked not only by those who would fain destroy the Bible and all belief in it, but by others who are solicitous for its claims as truly as any one can be. These latter insist that the moral uses of the story are not infringed upon if we suppose it, as to its supernatural part, to be a parable. For one, however, I can no more believe this in the case of Jonah than in the almost similar case of Job.

It is not denied by any objector that God could, had he so pleased, have brought it all to pass just as it is recorded. No one will rise up to say that he who made the fish and the man, could not have caused the man to remain alive within the fish. The greater includes the less, and it is not at all a question of God's power in the premises, but solely a question of his will. Did he will to do this, and did this actually occur?

The evidence for the actuality of the whole transaction is found (1), in the way in which it is recorded, there being not the slightest intimation in the book itself, or anywhere else in the Bible, that it is a parable. (2), In the almost unbroken evidence of tradition, the whole of the Jewish nation practically, accepting it as historic. (3), But especially in the testimony of Christ as recorded in Matthew 12:38, and parallel places. There are those who are able to read these words of the Savior in the

light of the argument of which they form a part, and say that they allude only to what he knew to be a parable, or an allegory, or a myth, but I am not of their number. Jesus would not have used such an illustration in such a connection, in my judgment, if it were not that of a historic fact.

CHAPTER XV.

THE "HOLY WRITINGS."

WE have seen the third part of the Old Testament, according to Jewish nomenclature known as the Holy Writings, to consist of Ruth, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Lamentations, and Daniel. Concerning this division as a whole a few introductory remarks may be desirable before considering the books separately.

In all probability the Law was canonized first, the constant reference to it in the later books of the Old Testament affording sufficient evidence of that fact. But the canonization of the Law must have given impulse to that of the Prophets, and this as soon as completed, to quote the language of Dr. Macpherson on the subject, must have called attention to the need of treating similarly the remaining books. Some of these books had long been current among the people, and others may have been the work of contemporaries of Ezra or even Malachi. The reason they were not included in the second division of the Canon is doubtless explained by their contents, which in large measure is different from the prophets. Prophecy is found in them, of course, but they are miscellaneous, nevertheless. The name "Prophets" having been appropriated to the second di-

ond division, that of "The Other Writings," and subsequently, "The Holy Writings," came naturally enough to designate this, although the one word "Psalms," from the chief book of the collection, is sometimes used for the whole. There is no record of any objections raised to the placing of these books in the Canon in the first instance, although disputes concerning them arose afterwards in unsuccessful attempts to have some of them withdrawn. The books objected to were Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, and Esther. Some Jewish rabbis, away back at about the beginning of the Christian era, sought the elimination of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, because they seemed to contain contradictory sayings. The battle was fought over the last-named book really, and the decision finally rendered in its favor.

We have already treated of three of these books as far as our space will permit, Ruth, Lamentations, and Daniel, for reasons stated in each case; but the present chapter affords an opportunity to refer to an important matter concerning the last-named not mentioned hitherto. For example, Why is Daniel placed among the Holy Writings and not among the Prophets? This, indeed, is one of the arguments used against the genuineness of the later chapters of Daniel, as though his place in the last division of the Old Testament were proof of a very late authorship. We have already shown the evidence for regarding the whole of Daniel to

have been written by that prophet during the captivity, but the answer to this particular question has been given thus: The real difference between Daniel and the prophets lies in the fact that his book is rather an apocalypse than a prophecy, and belongs more nearly to the poetical books or the Wisdom literature than to those preceding.

Taking up the list of the books in the third division not heretofore considered, Chronicles comes first, which originally went by the name of the "Diaries" or "Journals," because composed, as it was thought, from the diaries or court records of the different kings. They were also called "the things omitted," because they record many facts unnoticed in the earlier books of Kings. They are of a date later than the captivity, and although their author is unknown, yet their object seems to have been to show the division of families and possessions before that critical event in order to restore the same after the return. Emphasis, as you will find, is laid on the history of Judah rather than Israel, because of the Messianic expectations in that line.

Certain apparent discrepancies between Chronicles and Kings may be accounted for in at least two ways: (1), the former omits what the latter gives in sufficient detail and vice versa; and (2), the former being written much later doubtless than the latter, the names of certain localities, etc., may have undergone a change.

Ezra was of the priestly order, being of the tribe

of Levi and the family of Aaron, (7:1), and probably born in Babylon during the captivity. He joined his brethren at Jerusalem perhaps seventy years after the first return, bringing up with him a second large company of colonists. Parts of his book (4:8-6:18, 7:12-26), are written in the Babylonian language and consist of conversations or decrees in that tongue, but the rest is written chiefly in the first person and contains the history of the returning exiles, the re-building of the temple, and the story of his own commission as governor, his journey to Jerusalem and his exertions for the religious and political betterment of the people. The whole should be read in connection with the contemporaneous prophets Haggai and Zechariah,

According to tradition, as we have seen, it is Ezra who is supposed to have settled the Canon of the Old Testament and given permanence to the three-fold division of the Law, the Prophets and the Holy Writings. No serious question of criticism has arisen with reference to the genuineness of his own book, and he is supposed, moreover, to have compiled Chronicles and to have added the history of Nehemiah to his own.

Nehemiah, however, was the author of his own book, or the greater part of it, as may be gathered from even a superficial acquaintance with its contents. It takes up the history of the Jews in Jerusalem after the captivity about twelve years subsequent to the events in the book of Ezra, telling of the re-building of the city wall and gates and the

firmer re-establishment of the colony on a kind of national base. No account is given of the death of Nehemiah, but his book closes the history of the Old Testament. Like Ezra, no serious criticism has arisen as to the genuineness of the book of Nehemiah.

Esther belongs somewhere in the period between the time of the going up to Jerusalem of the first company of returning captives under Zerubbabel and the date of Ezra's mission. Xerxes is on the throne of Persia, who is called in the book "Ahasuerus," and the narration may have been taken from his court records (2:23, 6:1), a fact which would account for the secular tone of the book and its entire omission of the name of God. But as another says, "Though the name of God is not in the book, his hand is plainly seen there defeating and overruling evil to the salvation of his people."

The genuineness of the book is supported by the festival of "Purim" instituted at that time and maintained by the Jews to this day. It is supposed by some to be referred to in John 5:1, but if such is not the case there is no allusion to Esther in the New Testament. Nevertheless, let us always remember that it was part of the Canon of the Old Testament in Christ's day. In the last analysis we tie ourselves up to him.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE POETICAL BOOKS.

IN THE category of the Holy Writings, touched upon in the previous chapter, there are certain books particularly identified as the "Poetical Books" of which Job and the Psalms are samples, both of which will be treated of in this chapter.

That Job is a historical character would seem to be settled by such Scriptural allusions to him as Ezekiel 14:14, and James 5:11. Added to this the contents of the book itself is a proof of its historicity. Not only is there an absence of any intimation of its unhistorical character, but the details of persons and places in which it abounds testify to the opposite. Such things are not found in an allegory. Dr. Taylor Lewis, the distinguished Hebraist and commentator, says, that since there is nothing in the book itself to lead to the thought that it is unhistorical, it would amount to the perpetration of a fraud, if such were after all, the case. "In this respect," he goes on to say, "it differs from all the fables, riddles, parables and allegories of the Scripture, which no subsequent inspired writer was ever led to regard as actual history."

It is the apparent strangeness, the very unusual character of the recorded experiences of Job that leads certain critics to doubt its reality, but on

comparison with the records of Abraham, Jacob, Joseph and others of his contemporaries, it is not so strange.

I agree with those who place the period of Job as early as the patriarchs, and one thing that suggests it is the long life of Job, about 140 years, comparing more nearly with the ages to which men then lived than at any subsequent period. But there are allusions in the text of the book also which help to fix its period. For example, the worship of God described in the first and last chapters, is seen to be that of sacrifice without any officiating priest or any sacred place, just as we find it in the time of the patriarchs, but not in the time of Moses. The allusions to the worship of idolatry also, viz:, that of the heavenly bodies (31:26-28), point to the earliest form of idolatry known.

But there are certain omissions in the book which are equally strong evidence to its antiquity; for example, it never mentions the books of the Old Testament, or the history of Israel. This is almost incredible on the supposition that such a literature and such a people were in existence. Nor is there any mention of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, though those nations were in the neighborhood of Job's locality, and would have furnished a strong weapon in the hands of his "friends" to emphasize certain arguments they were insisting upon. Indeed, I find that many ex-

positors place Job as a contemporary of Abraham, and suppose the chronological order of the book to be somewhere between the 11th and 12th chapters of Genesis.

The question of the authorship of the book is perhaps indeterminable, some ascribing it to Job himself, some to Elihu, and some, the largest number perhaps, to Moses. Of course, the author may have lived much later than the hero, and gathered his material from tradition and earlier writings, compiling the whole in its present literary form under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit as in the case of other books to which reference has been made. Its place in the Old Testament Canon is authenticated by our Lord and his apostles. It was part of the Bible as they knew it, and as they used it.

The book of Psalms was in the Jewish Canon the first and most important of the "Holy Writings," and often gave its name to the whole (Luke 24:44). The Hebrew title (tehilim) means "praises," but our English word "psalms," is from the Greek, psalto, which means to strike a stringed instrument. According to tradition the psalms were gathered together by Ezra though some few additions may have been made afterward.

Among the authors David is the chief, 73 being ascribed to him by their titles, after him coming Asaph, the sons of Korah, Solomon, Heman, Ethan, and Moses, to the last three being ascribed one

psalm each. Many psalms are anonymous, and among those one has been ascribed to Jeremiah (137), one to Haggai (146), and one to Zechariah (147), though without any very strong authority in any case.

A modern Higher Critic, one of the most advanced and radical among them, Professor Cheyne, boldly avers that David did not write any of the psalms, and that they were all post-exilic. He asserts this on the supposition that the Israelites were not sufficiently advanced in spiritual culture in David's day to appreciate such expressions, and that David himself was not a man of such character and qualifications as to have written them. Scholars generally do not accept the view of Cheyne, and the readers of the foregoing chapters will hardly need specific answers to his affirmations. There was no period in Israel's history so well adapted for the expressions of some of the Davidic psalms as David's period, and the many-sided nature of the man, to say nothing of his heavenly inspiration, was an abundant equipment for the task. We may safely put over against these words of the English professor the estimates of such men of learning and piety as Athanasius, Basil, Luther, Milton, Hooker, Bishop Hall, Cardinal Newman, Dean Perowne, Charles H. Spurgeon and Alexander MacLaren, who find no difficulty in accepting a Davidic authorship. More of this, however, will be touched upon in the next chapter, and we may close this

with a simple reference to the fact, known to every reader of the New Testament, that the latter abundantly authenticates the book of Psalms as a whole "not only by direct citation, but the frequent employment of its phraseology in scattered sentences and phrases."

CHAPTER XVII.

THE TITLES OF THE PSALMS.

THE larger number of the Psalms, more than two-thirds of them indeed, have titles affixed, which are regarded by some as part of the inspired text and possessing the same authority. Among those who question this, it is nevertheless admitted that the title in every case records a tradition about the psalm of more or less historical value, as affording a clue to the time and occasion of its composition. There are certain features about these titles, too, which point to their very early origin, although until recently scholars have been altogether baffled about their meaning.

During the past year, however, a book has appeared by James William Thirtle (London), on "The Titles of the Psalms," which is not only throwing light upon the subject, but in so doing contributing as well to the traditional view of their antiquity and sustaining the question of their genuineness in that sense.

The remainder of this chapter is a quotation from a review of Mr. Thirtle's book in the "Tablet" (London), (December 1904), setting forth the whole matter very concisely and perspicuously, the timely value of which is the only apology necessary for its transcription:—

"The idea which Mr. Thirtle now brings before

the public is suggested in the first place by the psalm found in the third chapter of Habakkuk, which opens with the words: 'A prayer of Habakkuk the prophet upon Shigionoth,' and ends with: 'To the chief singer on my stringed instruments.' The possibility of misplacement amongst the titles in the Psalter occurred to the author. The psalms having been anciently written in continuo, it was difficult to know what belonged to a foregoing psalm and what to a following psalm when in later times divisions were made. After examination, Mr. Thirtle comes to the result that a distinction must be made between the musical and the literary or historical titles found in the Psalter. As in Habakkuk historical and literary notices precede the psalm, the musical titles are added as a subscript at the end of the psalm.

"A redistribution of these musical titles shows in many cases a clear connection between the titles and the contents of the psalms which precede them, where none whatever exists between them and the psalms which follow, and throws much new light upon the meaning of those obscure terms which have been so long discussed with so little result.

"As an example we may notice the title which occurs at the head of Psalm 56, 'For the chief musician: set to Jonath elem rehokim. A Psalm of David: Michtam: when the Philistines took him in Gath.' The translation of 'Jonath elem rehokim' is given generally as 'The dove of the distant terebinths,' or something similar. There is nothing in

the psalm over which it stands to suggest an explanation. When according to Mr. Thirtle's disposition of the titles it is brought into connection with the preceding Psalm 55 verses 6-8 at once offer an interpretation. 'Oh that I had wings like a dove: etc.,' and suggest the idea that these words are a pictorial title, founded on verses 6-8 of the Psalm.'

"Other titles, thus arranged, get a meaning in accordance with the etymology suggested by the Septuagint, much to be preferred to the fanciful explanations of later times. Thus Gittith, so often explained as a musical instrument, is again brought forward with the meaning of 'winepresses.' When the psalms which bear this subscript title are examined the conclusion is reached that these psalms were used at the feast of tabernacles, and that 'winepresses' is a term used to designate this autumn festival.

"Thus in association with their proper psalms, these titles serve a purpose. According to the author they mark: '(1) the reasons for which psalms were used in public worship; (2) commemmorations, and other special purposes for which psalms were selected; (3) choirs to which certain psalms were particularly assigned; (4) the topical description of psalms which easily lent themselves to such treatment.'

"Such a work as the above must necessarily be tentative and suggestive, rather than fully demonstrative, yet in the 174 pages which comprise the

first part of the book, there is much food for thought, and whatever opinion experts may come to in the future regarding the details of the theory, it seems clear that the main point, i. e., the rearrangement of the musical titles, not merely invites but demands consideration.

"Other conclusions which seem to follow from the main question are briefly referred to. The most interesting is 'the age of the Psalter.' If the traditional use of these terms had been lost before the time of the Septuagint, as is evident from the disordered state in which they are presented even at that age, it follows at once that these titles must be very old. And if the liturgical notices attached to the psalms are so ancient, what of the psalms themselves?

"In the midst of the Greek or Macedonian period of Israel's history, from the death of Alexander the Great till the time of the Maccabees, the psalms were misunderstood as to their shape, and important features of the worship of the old days were utterly beyond recall. The best that could be done in translating the Psalter into the world-language of the age was faulty and misleading where context failed, and the analogy of common things had nothing to say. If this was the condition of things from 323 to 146 B. C., if then the psalms as a collection had features that baffled the translators, how can it be supposed that the Maccabean period, say the generation of 160 to 130 B. C., should ac-

count for important contributions to the Psalter (p. 155)? So the movement is ever backward, to the days of David and his band of singers, of whom the Chronicler speaks, and some of whom are named as authors of the psalms."

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE WISDOM LITERATURE.

THERE are certain books under the general title of the "Holy Writings" that are sometimes designated the Wisdom Literature, particularly Proverbs and Ecclesiastes. To quote another, in many points "these are distinguished from the prophetic literature of Israel in that they express the philosophy of reflective minds rather than the express messages of Jehovah." They are inspired, of course, but the God who inspired them has more than one style of rhetoric, and uses all classes of minds in the production of his literary works just as he had originally made them to be used. "The human authors of these books do not deal with human experience and the problems of existence with the intense and high-wrought devotion, and the irresistible enthusiasm of the prophets when they exclaim, 'Thus saith the Lord,' but their thoughts nevertheless are made subservient to the highest purposes, and they utter, like the prophets, truths deeper than they knew, and words which awaited the interpretation of time."

In Solomon's day, and later, there was a distinct class of leaders among the people, known as "Wise Men," or "Teachers of Wisdom," who went about among the people holding classes for instruction something like the philosophers of Greece. They

delighted in colloquies and discussions, and the words spoken of Wisdom in the abstract, Proverbs 8:2-4, (Revised Version), had probably a literal fulfillment in the habits and methods of its professors. (The Bible Hand Book, p. 584). The reader will find interest in looking up this passage.

A proverb is a short sentence conveying moral truth in a concise and pointed form. It is a style of communication exciting attention, exercising ingenuity, and fastening truth on the mind in an agreeable and impressive way, and in the case of Solomon's proverbs its elegance and force are increased by the poetic parallelisms in which they are written. Nearly every sentence is antithetical or explanatory, and attending to corresponding clauses will often fix the reading and determine the sense.

That Solomon was the principal author of Proverbs, is indicated therein by chapters 1:1, and 25:1, compared with 1 Kings 4:29-32. The last two chapters, however, seem to be the work of other authors to whom reference is made in the text. Perhaps it is not necessary to suppose even that Solomon collected and edited the whole book, indeed, it contains a plain statement that this was not true of a portion of it. See chapters 25-29.

The ground for ascribing Ecclesiastes to Solomon are four-fold: (1) The indirect claim of the book itself as gathered from chapter 1, verses 1 and 12; (2) the general opinion of Jews and Christians from the earliest times; (3) the fitness of Solomon to write it; (4) the lack of agreement

among critics as to any other author or period. And yet modern criticism places its composition at a much later period on the ground of the evidence of its language and its contents. If it be asked how this can be done in the face of the indirect claim of the book, it is replied that it is only indirect, and that while the writer may be "identified as Solomon," it is only ideally, as though his spirit spoke in the words, "I was king."

We quote from our own earlier work on this book when we remark that its design seems to be to show the insufficiency of all earthly objects to confer happiness, and thus prepare man to receive the true happiness in Christ when presented to him. It is not affirmed that this was the design present in the mind of the human writer, but that it was the design of the Holy Spirit who inspired the writing.

There are many different plans or theories of the book. In the first place, there are those who conceive of it as a formal treatise on the vanity of human affairs. There are others who think it merely a collection of disconnected thoughts and maxims. A third class speak of it as a kind of sustained dialogue between a teacher and his pupils, as suggested in the introduction to the book of Proverbs. A fourth regard it as a biography of Solomon's own life, and a fifth, as an ideal book of the experience of the natural as distinguished from the spiritual man. This last does not necessarily exclude any of the others, but rather explains, perhaps, why any one of them may be taken as the correct view.

In the reading of this book it is ever to be kept in mind that some of its conclusions are only partially true and others altogether false, such as 2:16, 3:19, 9:2, etc. And if it be asked, How then can the book be inspired? the answer is that in contending for the inspiration of the Bible we do not claim the inspiration of the men, but the writings; while in the latter case it is not meant that every word thus written is true, and in that sense God's Word, but that the record of it is true. That is, God caused it to be written down that this or that man felt this or that way, and said thus and so, and hence the record of how he felt and what he said is God's record, and in that sense inspired.

Internal evidence seems to confirm the voice of antiquity that Solomon wrote the Canticles or Song of Songs (see 1 Kings 4:32), whose title carries with it the idea that it is the best of all his songs. Moreover, although it is not quoted in the New Testament, yet it always formed part of the Old as far as we have record, and, like all the other books, was in the canon of sacred Scripture which Jesus and his apostles recognized as such.

When it was written is not known, but its imagery seems to be drawn from the marriage of Solomon either with Pharaoh's daughter or some native of Palestine, espoused some years later, of noble birth, though inferior to her husband. For the first idea compare such places as 1 Kings 3:1, 7:8, 9:24, with chapters 1:9, and 6:12 of the song, and for the second, look at the language of the song, 2:1. 7:1,

1:6. A modern interpretation which Angus and others mention, gives an entirely different turn to the drama. The heroine is betrothed to a shepherd youth in Northern Palestine, where she is seen and wooed by Solomon, who takes her in his train to Jerusalem; but she proves unmovable to his attentions and faithful to her true lover, to whom she is in the end happily married with the king's approval.

The name "Canticles" which the book sometimes bears, however, suggests as a third idea that it is not one continued poem, but "a succession of lyrics, composed to be sung at a marriage feast." While this view removes some difficulties, it has nevertheless not been very extensively accepted by the scholars. All evangelical expositors are agreed however, that whatever view we take of the origin or groundwork of the book its higher aim is to set forth allegorically the relation of God to his ancient people, or of Christ to his church, or both. Every reader of the Bible knows that the union of Jehovah with Israel, and that of Christ and his church are represented under the same figure of marriage. See such passages as Psalm 45, Isaiah 54:6, Jeremiah 2:2, Hosea 2:14-23, Matthew 9:15, John 3:29, Ephesians 5:23-27, etc.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE OLD TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA.

IT SEEMS hardly necessary from one point of view to add to a work of this limited nature a chapter on the apocryphal books of the Old Testament; and yet there is a good deal of curiosity as to their character and history that ought to be satisfied, to say nothing of the effect it might have negatively, at least, in substantiating the evidence for the canonicity of the other books.

The word "Apocrypha" itself literally means "hidden," in the sense of secret, mysterious, occult, and applied in early times to that sacred literature of certain philosophic and religious sects which was intended only for the initiated or the elect—such literature, indeed, as is associated in our own time with the metaphysical teachings of the Orient imported into these Western lands.

But such an application of the word is far enough away from the idea of the revelation in the Bible. There is nothing secret in that sense in either the Old or New Testament. Christianity, surely, is intended for all men, and the same may have been said of Judaism though from another point of view. The word "mystery" is frequently used in the New Testament, but usually with reference to some divine truth which is about to be explained not to

a few but to all who are willing to receive it. All the treasures of knowledge and wisdom are said to be hidden in Christ, but whoever will receive Christ may receive them.

"Apocrypha," therefore, as applied to those books which have had a certain uncanonical relation to the Bible, is not employed so much in the sense of hidden or occult, as in the sense of spurious and false, and spurious and false chiefly, so far as any claim to divine inspiration or authority is concerned. The apocryphal books of the Old Testament, to quote another here, occupy a kind of intermediate place between the inspired Scriptures themselves and that secret or occult literature to which the name originally attached. Some of the contents of these books are of a high literary and historical value, and the churches of the Reformation considered them valuable for "examples of life and instruction of manners," while rejecting them utterly as of authority in matters of faith.

The names of these books are as follows: Tobit; Judith; Esther; The Wisdom of Solomon; The Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus; Baruch; The Song of the Three Holy Children; The History of Susanna; Bel and the Dragon; The Prayer of Manasses; 3 and 4 Esdras; 1 and 2 Maccabees. Most of them have an origin somewhat corresponding in time and place to the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament of which mention has been made; i. e., they were written at about that time, or somewhere between the 3rd century

B. C., and the 1st century A. D., and emanated, for the most part, from the Jewish Colony in Alexandria. They have found their way into our literature, however, through the avenue of the Roman Catholic Church, being attached first, to the Latin Vulgate, whose history we have touched upon, and thence to certain copies of the Bible in the English tongue.

As to the subject matter of these books, it may be interesting to those who have never read them to learn the following data condensed from a larger work upon this subject:

Tobit is a fictitious narrative intended to show how a pious Jew living in Nineveh might yet be true to his faith, and enjoy some of the blessed rewards of his fidelity. Judith is a story of about the same place and time, whose heroine, like Jael in the Old Testament, slew her nation's foe, a Chaldean general, named Holofernes. Esther is a kind of uninspired appendix to the Old Testament book of that name giving additional details, and claiming to quote from original documents of the Persian Court. The Wisdom of Solomon is a Greek imitation of the earlier part of Proverbs and is thought to belong to the Christian era. The Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus, is perhaps, the choicest of all from a literary point of view, and dates from an early period of the 2nd century B. C. Reference has been already made to certain of the contents of this book as substantiating the genuineness of the Old Testament as we

now possess it. The recent discovery of an old manuscript has been a kind of bombshell in the camp of the ultra critics. Baruch has been described as "a feeble imitation" of the language and style of Jeremiah, the illusion being strengthened by the use of the name of his former associate and amanuensis. Its date is unknown. The Song of the Three Holy Children purports to have been that uttered in the furnace by Shadrach, Meschach and Abednego (see Daniel 3). The History of Susanna and Bel and the Dragon are also supplementary to the same canonical book of Daniel. The Prayer of Manasses, or Manasseh, is a penitential psalm placed on the lips of that wicked but humbled king of Judah. 3 and 4 Esdras, or Ezra, give some incidents from the Old Testament related with deviations, and also a series of apocalyptic visions, partly of Jewish, and partly of Christian origin and thought to date from about the close of the first century A. D. Maccabees is an accurate and valuable history of Jewish affairs from the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes, King of Syria, B. C. 175, to the death of Simon Maccabeus (135), The latter was a Jewish prince, one of the line of brothers who were successful for a while in breaking the foreign yoke before the days of the Roman Empire. 2 Maccabees is an abridgement of a longer history covering about the same period but quite independent of the other. (The Bible Handbook, Revised Ed. pp. 613-614.)

If, in closing this chapter, we should seek to

answer the question, Why are not these books, or any of them, included in the Canon, or rather, on what ground are they excluded, we might say:

1. They do not claim divine authority as almost all the accepted books do.

2. In some cases they altogether disclaim such authority. (See the Introduction to Ecclesiasticus, and also 2 Maccabees 11:23, 15:38).

3. They contain statements here and there at variance with the facts, at variance with themselves for that matter, not to say at variance with the Scriptures. (Compare Baruch 1:2 with Jeremiah 43:6-7. See also 2 Maccabees 12:43 and the following verses).

4. They are not found in any catalog or list of the sacred Scriptures for the first four centuries of the Christian era.

5. The Jews never received them as canonical.

6. Christ and his apostles never quoted them.

It is true that the Roman Catholic Church accepts these books as canonical, but even she has only done so since the Council of Trent, 1545.

CHAPTER XX.

THE NEW TESTAMENT CANON.

ITS importance justifies an introductory chapter on the general subject of the canon of the New Testament before we take up the consideration of the separate books. And let us begin by saying that those books and none others are regarded as canonical which were known either to have been written by an apostle or received as of divine authority in the apostolic age. The way to reach an understanding upon this subject is very simple. The canon doubtless was formed quite gradually. The books (we speak now of the epistles more particularly), appeared separately, in different localities and at different periods, each bearing the evidence of its own origin with it to the church to which it was addressed. Copies were made, and as they were distributed to other churches the evidence of their genuineness was distributed with them. Exchanges were made in the same way. The church at Rome would in time send a copy of its epistle to the church at Corinth, which in turn, would send a copy of that which it had received to Rome, and so on. By and by lists or catalogs of these books would begin to be made and handed down to succeeding generations and centuries, by which the genuineness of the genuine and the falsity of the false might easily be kept in mind. Dr.

Flournoy, the author of a comparatively recent work on this subject, shows from newly recovered documents of the ancients that the canon of the New Testament just as we have it, especially as it applies to the Gospels, was the original and only canon, it being freely quoted by men living in the latter part of the first and the first part of the second century, who recognized the books as standing on a plane of authority not shared by any other books. And Dr. Harnack, the great German critic and theologian of modern times, not prejudiced in favor of evangelical Christianity, to say the least, testifies, that "as regards the text of the Gospels we may conclude that about the year 160 it ran just as it runs now."

But to return to the matter of the catalogs, there were no less than 15 or 16 of them published between the second and the fourth centuries, and these by different authors and in different lands, tht greatest pains being taken to secure accurate information. There were "Lower" and "Higher" critics in those days just as there are now, only that they had access to original sources which their modern successors are denied. Sometimes these critics journeyed to Palestine and resided there while sifting evidence, and if they came across a forgery it was treated with the greatest strictness. One such was discovered in the second century, for instance, an Asiatic presbyter published a book called "The Acts of Paul and Thecla," and tried to palm it off as authentic, but when he was discover-

ed he was deposed, and all the churches duly notified.

Let us remember another thing, that the appeal of these inspired writings was to the Christian consciousness, the church consciousness, not to the consciousness of one Christian or one hundred, not to the consciousness of one church or one hundred, but to all, the universal Christian, the universal church consciousness. It is remarkable in this connection, as others have pointed out, that no church council from the earliest times ever undertook to define the canon. It was unnecessary. "The Scriptures of the New Testament were their own attestation. Certain books claiming apostolic authority were for a time accepted in some places, but gradually disappeared from the list and fell in among the apocryphal," for there are apocryphal books of the New Testament as of the Old.

We can readily see how this took place, and why it took place, if we ourselves take the pains to compare these apocryphal books with the genuine. Between the best of the first-named and those of the New Testament "there is a great gulf fixed." Dr. Samuel G. Green aptly illustrates it by the contrast between modern and ancient cities. The modern has wide suburbs reaching out into the open country so that the exact boundaries are indiscernible, but the ancient were confined within walls and separated from all the waste beyond. The New Testament books are represented by the latter, surrounded by high bulwarks which make

them easily defined. As the same writer adds, the Holy Spirit, given to the church, quickened holy instincts, aided discernment between the genuine and spurious, and thus led to gradual, harmonious, and in the end unanimous conclusions. There was in the church, he says, what a modern writer has happily termed an "inspiration of selection." And this same inspiration, it may be remarked, is in the church still. No one can palm off a spurious book on the church today any more than in the earliest day of her existence.

Perhaps the reader would like to know a little more in detail about the catalogs. The earliest is now known as the Muratorian Fragment. It is called a "Fragment" because the whole of it is not there, and it is called the "Muratorian" Fragment because of its discovery by an Italian named Muratori in the Ambrosian Library, at Milan, somewhere about 1740. The date of this fragment is that of the second century of the Christian era, but beginning with Luke, which it calls the third Gospel, implying the two preceding ones, it names all the books as we now have them excepting Hebrews, James, 1 and 2 Peter, and 2 and 3 John. Of about the same date as the Muratorian Fragment may be named once more, the Syriac and Latin Versions which are catalogs of the highest order for they contain the very books themselves as we have seen. The Latin omitted only Hebrews, James and 2 Peter, and the Syriac 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude and Revelation.

Moreover of about this same date or a little later, it may be about the first quarter of the third century, we have the testimony of Clement of Alexandria, named in the history of Eusebius, who quotes or refers to all the books except, I believe, James, 2 Peter, and 3 John. Tertullian and Justin Martyn of this period may be quoted to the same purport. While Clement was of Alexandria, however, Tertullian was of Carthage and Justin Martyn of Palestine. Then comes Origen, also of Alexandria, and the most illustrious Christian scholar of his age who mentions all and records doubts only of 2 Peter and 2 and 3 John. A strong testimony to the canonicity of the New Testament at this period, the third century, is the fact that certain heretics as well as the faithful admitted it, and on the basis, thereof, sought to defend their heresies. Then follows Eusebius himself, the father of church history, as he has been called, who about 300 A. D., or a little later, published a catalog in which he mentions all, recording doubts, however, as to James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. These doubts are not his own but those of others whom he records.

We need not pursue this farther. Some of the later enemies of the faith have tried to prove that we Christians did not get our Bible till the fourth century. They have said there was a church council about that time in the city of Nice, France, one of whose purposes was to make a Bible. There had been many books floating around, claiming to

be inspired, and nobody knew which were and which were not inspired. Copies of all these books were collected at the time of this council and placed under the communion table in the church. Then the bishops gathered around the table and prayed that in some way the inspired books might be indicated from the uninspired, and as they prayed, a number of the books were supernaturally raised from underneath the table and placed on top of it. These were accepted as the inspired books, they say, and this is the way the Christians got their Bible!

The grain of wheat in that bushel of chaff is this: That there was such a council at Nice at that time, A. D. 325, and one of the things it did was to set forth a catalog of all the inspired books of the New Testament, which had been so accepted as inspired by the whole church since the first. That catalog is the same as we have today.

CHAPTER XXI.

WHY FOUR GOSPELS?

IN THE progress of our studies we have reached the books of the New Testament and the question of the genuineness of the four Gospels. And at the beginning an inquiry suggests itself as to why there are four Gospels? Why was not one enough? And if more than one were needed, why not five, or twenty? Why just four? There must be some reason for this.

This, in turn, brings up another question, What is the nature and significance of the Gospels? Why are these first four books of the New Testament called the "Gospels?" The word "Gospel" means good news, and distinctively, that good news of which God is the author, and which Christ came to preach, and of which he is himself the sum and substance in his work for the salvation of men. Strictly speaking, of course, there is, and can be, but one Gospel, but one story of who he is and what he did, although this story may be presented from more than one point of view. Now, when we seek further the why and the wherefore for four points of view, we seem to find it in the Old Testament. Christ as the Coming One is foretold there, and although he is presented variously in type and prophecy, yet when all these pre-intimations of his

person and work are grouped and classified, they range themselves under four heads. He is seen as the Messiah, the King of Israel; he is seen as the Servant of Jehovah; he is seen as the Son of man; and he is seen as the Son of God. As corresponding to this, Matthew's Gospel presents him in the first light, Mark's in the second, Luke's in the third, and John's in the fourth.

Dr. E. W. Bullinger, in one of his writings, exhibits this from the Old Testament in a very interesting way. There are, for example, twenty Hebrew words translated "Branch," but only one of them, (Tsemech), is used exclusively of the Messiah, and this only four times, as follows:

Jeremiah 23:5, 6, "Branch" the king.
Zechariah 3:8, "Branch" the servant.
Zechariah 6:12, "Branch" the man.
Isaiah 4:2, "Branch" Jehovah.

There is still another very interesting fact related to this inquiry as to why there are four Gospels. For, just as we find the Savior presented to men under four different aspects, so we find four different classes of men to whom these aspects must have severally appealed. A suggestion of three of these classes is found in Pilate's inscription on the cross at Golgotha, which was in letters of Hebrew, of Latin and of Greek. These were the languages of the representative races of that day who differed from each other in ways that were very marked.

The Hebrews were the children of revelation,

and would be interested in no person claiming to be their Messiah who did not fulfill the teachings of the Old Testament prophets concerning him. Hence Matthew writes distinctively for them as it were, and meets their peculiar need by presenting Jesus from that point of view, and showing him to be unmistakably the promised King of Israel of whom the prophets spake.

The Romans were the active, energetic people of the time. The race that did things. Their ideal was power, as evidenced in their worship of the state, or rather the emperor representing the state, to their mind the highest expression of power. Mark writes distinctively for them, presenting Jesus in such a way as to attract them, the man of power, of energy, the active Servant of Jehovah, the whole Gospel vibrating with movement.

The Greeks, on the other hand, were the intellectual and contemplative people. Their ideal was wisdom. They conceived their mission to be to elevate man, not man as a race so much as the individual man. In that sense they were looking for the ideal man, and Luke presents him in Jesus the divine Son of man.

These first three Gospels, sometimes called the synoptics for a reason to be named later, did the work now usually ascribed to the foreign missionary. That is, they made converts to the Christian religion from among the three classes of men just described. But these converts by becoming Chris-

tians made of themselves a fourth class, they constituted the Christian church for which in a sense, a special Gospel was required. To meet their necessities John wrote a generation later than the other evangelists, recording certain deeds, and especially discourses, of Jesus which they had not recorded, and which were more fitted to answer the deeper questions concerning his person and work that had come up with the progress and development of the church. Fod further discussion of why there are four Gospels, the reader is referred to the author's earlier work, "Synthetic Bible Studies."

Let us now consider more particularly, that further two-fold division of the Gospels already hinted at in the use of the word "Synoptics" as differentiating the first three from the fourth. There is a remarkable agreement among the first three as distinguished from the fourth, an "agreement in the incidents and sayings selected and in the general order in which they are presented. Side by side they yield a synopsis or conspectus, i. e., the same general view or outline," from which the word describing them is derived. On the other hand, the fourth Gospel stands alone. "The writer's purpose is not so much to tell the story of the earthly life of Jesus, as to interpret him as 'the Christ, the Son of God.' Familiarity with the facts and persons of the synoptics is constantly assumed, and while here and there the narratives coincide, yet for the

most part the incidents are new and selected for the writer's special purpose."

The question now arises as to the human source of the Synoptics? Of course, as to their divine source it will be shown in a later part of our work the sense in which they were inspired. But the agreements among them seem to point to a common human source, while the differences indicate at the same time a great measure of independence. Scholars are unable to explain this, although all are agreed that there was at first an oral or spoken Gospel, in other words, that the facts about Jesus Christ were told by the apostles and early disciples perhaps for twenty-five or thirty years before it was felt necessary to commit them to writing. This necessity was felt as the first generation of Christians began to pass away and the Lord still tarried. The idea is prevalent in these days that Mark's Gospel was the earliest of all, and constituted a kind of original from which the first and third Gospels copied adding a little here and there, and changing the arrangement to suit these additions; but whether this was so or not we find in the introduction to the third Gospel, Luke 1:1-4, a very good account of the manner in which any one of the three might have been put together, at least in part. You will find on reading the verses named that "Luke disclaimed any first-hand knowledge of what he chronicles, but with painstaking accuracy has gathered and sifted his authorities." Among

these latter were the testimonies of "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," he tells us, as well as "many" written fragments of which Mark, or even some earlier document may have had the chief place. Scholars know positively of no other earlier document, but imagine one to suit their convenience which they have designated as the "Logia," which simply means the word or the oracles.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE STORY OF THE SYNOPTICS.

WE SHALL in this chapter consider the story of the synoptics in the order in which they appear in the Bible. It can not be determined precisely when they were written, but there is practical unanimity that it was not later than A. D. 65, or about 30 years after our Lord's ascension. The argument for this was hinted at in an earlier chapter where reference was made to the catalogs and the writings of the early Christian fathers, but those who wish more particular data will find them in Smith's Bible Dictionary under the head of "Canon" or "Canonicity."

Tradition is a unit in ascribing the first Gospel to Matthew. It has always stood as it does now, the first of the four, and the beginning of the New Testament. Whether this is because of its earliest date, or the nature of its contents, or for some other reason is unknown. Nevertheless as to its authorship, it does to a certain extent bear its own credentials. Its author must have been a Christian Jew. Even a superficial perusal of its contents indicates that. He must also have been an eye-witness of most of what he relates, and familiar with the times as well as the events he describes. All this is seen on the face of the narrative.

The only incident related of the writer himself in the book is his call to discipleship (9:9). In the corresponding places in Mark and Luke, however, he is designated as Levi, which may have been his real name, while Matthew was an assumed one, taken by him at the time of his call. The latter means, "The Gift of Jehovah." Mark says that Matthew was the son of Alpheus. Does this mean that he was the brother of James (Matthew 10:3)? Hardly so. Another Alpheus must be meant, for these two are never coupled together in any list of the apostles as is the case where other brothers are referred to. Matthew was a publican, a collector of taxes under the Roman government, an office odious in the sight of the Jews, and stationed at Capernaum. Publicans were classed with the sinners and outcasts of society, and it was the sneer of the Pharisees that Jesus mingled with such. That Matthew, at least, wrote as early as the date already mentioned, is determined by the circumstance that he alludes to Jerusalem and the temple, (4:5, 5:35, 22:7, and elsewhere), in language implying that their destruction (A. D. 70), had not as yet taken place.

As has been said, he wrote distinctively for the Jews, a fact borne witness to not only by the writers of the first three centuries of the Christian era, but by the central plan of the Gospel itself. It is very clearly its plan to present Jesus as the Messiah of the Old Testament prophets and the King of Israel. In pursuance thereof the reader will notice

that the genealogy of Jesus is traced to Abraham the founder of the Jewish race, that frequent references are made to the Old Testament prophets and the fulfilment of their predictions in Jesus, to the kingdom which Jesus came to set up and other things of the kind not spoken of in the same way or with the same emphasis, in the other Gospels. Furthermore, it will be noticed that unlike Mark for example, and sometimes John, Matthew in speaking of Jewish customs and localities never pauses to explain or describe them, as if those for whom he wrote understood his references. Those who would like to peruse an outline of his Gospel as compared with the others will find help in the author's "Synthetic Bible Studies."

The second Gospel has always been ascribed to Mark, the John Mark of the Acts and the Epistles, although his own personality as its author is nowhere obtruded within its pages. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, who lived and flourished in the early part of the second century, and who made it his business, he tells us, to inquire of the contemporaries of the apostles about these things, bears record that "Mark having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately all that he remembered of the words and deeds of Christ, although not in regular order." This connection of Mark with Peter is further borne out by others of the earliest Christian writers following Papias, thus making the basis of the second Gospel that "of the evangelic narrative used by Peter in his public

teaching." Justin Martyn indeed, one of these early writers, speaks of this Gospel as from the "Memoirs of Peter."

For the personal history of Mark one must be referred to such places as Acts 12:12, 25, 13:5, 13, 15:36-40, Colossians 4:10, 11, 2 Timothy 4:11, and 1 Peter 5:13. He was companion of Paul for a while, then of Barnabas, and finally of Peter. The estrangement from Paul recorded in the Acts seems to have been fully healed according to the references in the later epistles. "It is an interesting conjecture," says one, "that the house of John Mark referred to in Acts 12:12 may have been the house where (in the lifetime of Mark's father) the Last Supper was eaten (Mark 14:14); that the garden of Gethsemane was the property of its owner; and that Mark himself was the 'young man of the incident related only by him (14:51,52)."

Mark, it has been said, wrote for the Romans, a belief to which all the writers of the first three centuries bear testimony, and which is corroborated by the central plan of the Gospel itself, which is to present Jesus as the energetic servant of Jehovah. The reason for such a presentation was suggested in the preceding chapter, but the proof of it is seen in the brevity of the Gospel, for example, and the omission of the discourses of Jesus rather than the acts. This fact, or rather these two facts, give point to the assumption that Mark was writing for a people more likely to be interested in concrete results than abstract philosophizing. Indeed, the

whole construction of Mark's narrative, and even certain words and phrases he uses constantly, lending vividness and power to his record, are seen to promote this same purpose. Take the word "straightway" for example, sometimes translated forthwith, or immediately, and which he uses forty-two times as compared with thirty-three times in the other Gospels. Observe that whatever its connection, this word uniformly designates rapidity of movement and promptness of action, appealing to the Roman spirit. Mark, moreover, explains Jewish customs and traditions as one would who is addressing a foreign people, see, for example, chapter 7:1-4, etc. For more of these details the reader is referred as previously, to "Synthetic Bible Studies."

There has been some question among scholars as to the genuineness of the latter half of the last chapter of Mark's Gospel, verses 9-20. Every one who reads that chapter carefully notices a change at verse 9 from a vivid and continuous narrative to one more condensed and fragmentary, and wonders why? The style is rather unlike Mark in some particulars, and the verses are not found in some of the oldest manuscripts and versions. Nevertheless, while doubt attaches to them, it has not been sufficient to justify the revisers in omitting them, and no mention would have been made of the matter here but that it is occasionally referred to by others.

Luke has always been accepted as the author of

the third Gospel, no serious question ever having been raised about it since the middle of the second century. Scholars, however, have usually regarded it as the latest of the synoptics, basing their opinion upon the language of the prologue, 1:1-4, referred to in the last chapter, and upon certain touches showing what they conceive to be development in the treatment of the common tradition.

Legend has been busy with the name of this author as with other of the primitive Christians, identifying him as a Gentile and native of Antioch, but whether a proselyte to the Jewish faith before his conversion to Christianity or not, is not assumed to be known. His Gentilism is shown by the circumstance that in Colossians 4:11-14, he, with Epaphras and Demas is distinguished from those "who are of the circumcision." He is spoken of as one of the seventy sent out by our Lord, and one of the two with whom he conversed on the way to Emmaus, but this only on the ground that he alone of the evangelists mentions these things.

There is little doubt, however, that as Mark wrote under the direction and influence of Peter, so Luke wrote as a kind of representative of Paul. and as some think during the latter's imprisonment in Jerusalem and Caesarea. The intimacy of Luke with Paul is seen in such passages as Colossians 4:14, 2 Timothy 4:11, and Philemon 24. Significant, too, is the exchange of the historical "they" in the Acts of the Apostles (which, as we shall soon see, Luke also wrote), for the aubio-

graphical "we," showing that from Troas to Philippi he was with Paul, that he journeyed with him to Jerusalem, spent much of the time with him during his two years' imprisonment at Caesarea, sailed into Italy with him, and remained during most of his long captivity in Rome. (See Acts 10:11, 16:8, 21, etc). "Luke, the companion of Paul, put down in a book the gospel preached by him," says Ireneus, writing about A. D. 180, and subsequent writers maintain this tradition unbroken. The same view of the authorship is strengthened by the correspondences between the general scope of this Gospel and Paul's teaching about grace, forgiveness, justification, and kindred themes. The universality of the Gospel is more marked in Luke than in the other synoptics, suggesting Paul's preaching to the Gentiles, see especially 17: 10, and 18:14. The account of the institution of the Lord's Supper in Luke also, is almost identical with that of Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:23-25, while there are points of resemblance as well in the accounts of the resurrection, compare Luke 24 with 1 Corinthians 15:1-7.

The universality of the Gospel as set forth by Luke is one of the features relied upon to show that he was writing for the Greeks distinctively—a people more interested in man as man than any other. Other features are found in the classic Greek in which the book is composed, in the fact that the discourses of Jesus are enlarged upon rather than his acts, appealing particularly to the

meditative and intellectual side of man, and in the fact that Jesus himself is set forth as the ideal man. i. e., a perfect humanity united with divinity. To quote Dr. Moorehead here: "Luke's is the Gospel of the kinsman Redeemer whose compassions go out to all sorts of people, whose pity is as wide as the race of man. His genealogy is traced not merely to Abraham, but up to Adam, the father of the race, thus linking him with all mankind. The key is the midnight song of the angels—the Gloria in Excelsis, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

CHAPTER XXIII.

DID THE APOSTLE JOHN WRITE THE FOURTH GOSPEL?

SO FAR as the Gospels are concerned the storm center of the rationalistic criticism gathers around the last of the four. We have shown why this should be the case. John wrote a generation later than the synoptics. He wrote for the Christian church. He was detained on the earth, the last of the twelve apostles, until the close of the first century for that very purpose.

As the church grew and developed, questions would come up and heresies arise concerning the deeper and graver problems of the faith, especially those touching the Person and work of our blessed Lord. Was he divine as well as human? What was the real nature of the work he came into the world to do? How was that work to be carried on after his departure out of the world?

Such questions as these are dealt with in no other Gospel as they are in that of John. And they are dealt with not by any philosophizing on John's part, but by the simple record of doings and discourses of Jesus not found in the synoptics. Did not the writers of the synoptics know of these doings and discourses as well as John? Yes, doubt-

less, but the time was not ripe for their broadcast publication.

There was an occasion when Jesus himself said to his disciples, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye can not bear them now;" and there was a sense in which this was true for a while of the early church in the matter of acquainting it with all that "Jesus began to do and to teach until the day in which he was taken up." John was reserved to say some things about him not said before, and these particular things were calculated to impress the truth of his deity, and the sacrificial character of his death as nothing else had done. The witness of John the Baptist to Christ, recorded only in this Gospel, is one of these things. The raising of Lazarus from the dead is another. The discourses of Jesus on the New Birth (3), on the Living Water (4), on the Bread of Life (6-7), on his own deity (5), and on his departure and return (14-16), are another. John's Gospel is almost entirely new as compared with the synoptics, and the object of the Holy Spirit in its revelation to men can not be misunderstood.

No wonder, therefore, that those who would like to get rid of the supernatural from the Bible, and especially destroy faith in the deity of Jesus Christ, and the necessity of his atonement for a guilty and lost race, should rally all their forces to undermine belief in the genuineness of the fourth Gospel. No wonder they should try to prove that the Apostle never wrote it. No wonder they should seek to

discover some other John, a presbyter of the second century say, who had conceived a spurious story and palmed it off upon the church as true! More incredible far is such error than the truth.

Now, how may we be assured that John, the Apostle, wrote the Gospel by his name? In the first place, for the personal history of John, especially in his relation to Jesus, if we desire to refresh our memory about it, let us look at the following Scripture passages: Matthew 17:1, 26:37, 27:56. Mark 1:20, 3:17, 5:37; John 19:26-27; Acts 3:4, 8; Revelation 1:9-11. For his later history after Patmos, we have nothing but tradition, but that, without deviation, locates him at Ephesus between the final departure thence of Paul and the close of the first century.

The evidence that he wrote the fourth Gospel is the same in general terms as that already given for the other books of the New Testament. The mss. of the fourth and the versions of the second century A. D., all contain the Gospel and attribute it to John. This is true of all the early catalogs. Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons, who died A. D. 202, says it was written by "John the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast," and affirms that "he wrote in Ephesus, where he remained till the time of Trajan (A. D. 98-117)." This is the almost unanimous testimony of the Christian writers of the second and third centuries. To quote the Bible Handbook at this place, not literally, but with practical accuracy, "Recent investigations and discover-

ies prove the use of this gospel by Tatian and Justin Martyn, who were contemporaries of about the period of A. D. 170. Citations are found from it in Valentinus and Basiledes about A. D. 130 or 125; and a familiarity with it is shown in the writings of Ignatius and Polycarp carrying us back to the very time of John himself, the opening of the second and the close of the first century."

Dr. Plummer, in his "Introduction to the Gospel by John," in the "Cambridge Bible Commentary," puts a pertinent question thus: he says, "Those who deny that St. John wrote the fourth gospel have tried almost every date for it from 110 to 165. Dividing that time in two parts, we have the following dilemna:

"(1), If the gospel was published between 110 and 140, why did not the hundreds of Christians then living who had known John during his later life denounce the forgery?

"(2), If it was not published till between 140 and 165, how did it become universally accepted by 170?"

Reference has been made above to the use of this Gospel by Tatian as early as the date just mentioned in the quotation from Dr. Plummer. There is such an apt and interesting story illustrating its genuineness in connection with his name, that I feel justified in occupying the space to tell it. Tatian was a Christian apologist, that is, a public defender of the faith, during the early period referred to, and put forth among his other works what

has been known as his "Diatessaron," from "dia," through, and "tessaron," four, a kind of harmony, in other words, of the four Gospels. All the copies of this work had been lost for centuries and its original existence had been altogether doubted by opponents. The author of "Supernatural Religion," a famous work of the rationalistic school, which has passed through many editions since its first publication in 1875, said, very defiantly, "There is no authority for saying that Tatian's Gospel was a harmony of the four Gospels at all. No one seems to have seen Tatian's Harmony, probably for the simple reason that there was no such work."

Now at the very time that this blatant expression appeared, there was lying in the Vatican library at Rome a certain Arabic manuscript numbered XIV. No one seems to have known of it till 1883, when one of the Guild of Writers to the Vatican examined it and found it to be a version of this very Diatessaron! He published an essay on it in Paris at the time. About three years later, however, a Visitor Apostolic to the Copts on a journey to the Vatican, happened to see it and declared that he could obtain a duplicate of it in Egypt, which he did. In 1888 this was translated into Latin in honor of the Pope's jubilee. It opens with the first words of John's Gospel and contains practically the whole of it.

It thus proves that a man living in the early part of the second century had the Gospel of John before him, which must have been in circulation and

well-known. Of course it is understood that these versions of the Diatessaron thus discovered, are only copies of the original and not the original itself. But these copies, one of them at least, dates from about the middle of the eleventh century, or earlier, while of course their existence proves that of the original. Thus they utterly demolish the hypothesis of the rationalistic critics that the Gospel was not written by the Apostle John but by some unknown individual not earlier than near the close of the second century.

It may be interesting to add that the explanation of the concealment of these written copies of the Diatessaron for so long a time is that they were what are called palimpsests, i. e., a parchment on which one writing covers another. Parchment was expensive material, and when a writing upon it was supposed to have had its day, it was removed by chemicals and another written on the same pages. Sometimes it happened, however, that the removing process was not as thorough or as lasting as was supposed, and the older writing would reappear after a time through the later writing. This appears to have been the case with the writings in question. God has many ways of hiding his witnesses from harm until he is ready to bring them into court.

CHAPTER XXIV.

INTERNAL EVIDENCES OF JOHN'S GOSPEL.

IN OUR last chapter we sought to show from the external point of view that the Apostle John wrote the fourth Gospel, quoting the testimony of manuscripts, versions and catalogues of the early Christian writers, down to the period of the Apostle's death. Of course, the whole thing was in the nature of a bird's eye view, nothing more, and yet it was true as far as it went, and sufficient because true. But the following words quoted from Archdeacon Farrar in his "The Messages of the Books," will help to reassure any who would have liked to examine the subject more thoroughly:—

"It has been my duty to study all that can be urged against the Gospel by John, but in none of the able critics who have persuaded themselves that the Gospel of John was the work of a Gnosticising dreamer in the second century, have I met with any argument that does not seem to me to have been fully and fairly answered. Dr. Westcott especially, in his valuable commentary, has proved in a most decisive manner that the writer was a Jew; a Jew of Palestine; an eye witness; and an Apostle; and when this is established, the inference comes irresistibly that he was the Apostle John."

The reference above to what Dr. Westcott says, however, opens up an entirely different line of testimony from that pursued in the previous chapter, namely, the internal evidences to the Johannine authorship; and the deep and current importance of the theme warrants our devoting this chapter to its consideration.

As you perceive, the internal evidence is grouped by Westcott, as it is by writers generally, under four heads:—That the author was a Jew; a Jew of Palestine; an eye witness; and an apostle. It will be interesting to observe the proofs of these facts and consider their bearing on the genuineness of the Gospel. Dr. Marcus Dods, of Edinburgh, very recently lectured on this subject in America, and from a report of one of his lectures in "The Bible Record," I have received liberty to extensively quote. This I am pleased to do, because of his fresh treatment of the subject, and because he is one of the modern theological scholars not always regarded as quotable on the side of the more conservative evangelical teaching:

A. That the writer was a Jew he regards as proved (1) by his Hebraistic style. His Gospel, while written in Greek, of course, and while not ungrammatical or awkward is, nevertheless, limited in its vocabulary, and the words used are only such as are familiar in ordinary conversation. Were he a born Grecian, or educated in that tongue like Paul, for example, his style would be very different (2), That he was a Jew is seen by his knowledge of

Aramaic terms, that language which was a kind of mixture of Hebrew and Chaldean. For example, he inserts translations of Aramaic names, see 1:38-42; 9:7; 19:13-17; 20:24. (3), That he was a Jew is seen in his familiarity with Jewish customs, ideas and institutions. For Jewish customs see 1:49; 2:6; 13:4; 19:40. For Jewish ideas, 1:21; 4:27; 9:2; 18:29, and a large part of chapter 7. For Jewish institutions, 1:19; 2:20. 10:22; 18:20. It is but right to add, however, that some have maintained that the Jews and their usages are spoken of in this Gospel as if they belonged to a race different from that of the writer. For instance, the latter speaks of the water pots at Cana as being set "after the manner of the purifying of the Jews," and in another place, that "the Jews' passover was nigh at hand." A Jew born and bred would never have come to speak so, it is said; but the answer is, that John at the time of writing was a foreigner to Palestine, i. e., for years a resident abroad, and was writing to foreigners who had known little or nothing of Palestine and its people. Under these circumstances such expressions are precisely what might be expected.

B. That the writer was a Palestinian, i. e., born and bred in that land is seen (1), by his intimate knowledge of its localities. Our author quotes Professor Ramsay as saying that it is impossible for any one to invent a tale whose scene lies in a foreign land, without betraying in slight details his ignorance of the scenery and circumstances amid

which the event is described as taking place. But the author of the fourth Gospel must have been a resident. Bethany with him is "nigh unto Jerusalem, about 15 furlongs off." This is "the unconscious gratuitousness of full knowledge." See chapter 6 for a minute description of the movements around the sea of Galilee. Observe how familiar is the author with the temple, its porches, cloisters and the like. He crosses brooks and gardens in his walks without once stumbling into error. He adds to the name of a town the additional specification by which it must be distinguished from others of the same name. "Bethany beyond Jordan," "Aenon near to Salim." It was once charged against the author of this Gospel that he was ignorant of the localities he describes. The critics supposed they knew better than he. But recent research under the direction of the Palestinian Survey has changed all this. It is now admitted on all hands that in these matters, at least, the writer knew what he was talking about. (2), But he is seen to be a Palestinian as well by the copy of the Bible he evidently used. A Jew living in some other part of the world would have almost certainly used the Septuagint Greek Version in his allusions to and quotations from the Old Testament. But the author of the fourth Gospel departs from that and uses language more nearly representing the Hebrew, so nearly indeed, as to leave small doubt in the minds of competent scholars that he translated it for himself.

C. That the writer was an eye-witness of what he describes is seen in various ways. (1), He claims to be an eye-witness. Read 1:14, in comparison with 1 John 1:1, also 19:35, and 21:24. The author of these words was either an eye-witness, or else "a forger whose genius for truth and for lying are alike inexplicable." (2), This claim is confirmed by the character of the Gospel as indicated by multitudinous details. Mark the hour at which Jesus sat by the well, the number and size of the water pots at Cana, the weight and value of the ointment, the number of fish at the last cast, etc., etc. Such details, as Dr. Dods wisely remarks, invite the detection of error. Circumstantiality may be given to a narrative of the imagination, but aside from the fact that the Jews were not writers of fiction, this circumstantiality belongs to the realm of fact, to real objects and events which in many cases can be verified.

D. That the writer was the Apostle John follows almost necessarily from the above, but it is further demonstrated thus:—In chapter 21:20-24, especially 24, he is identified with the disciple whom Jesus loved. Who was this disciple? He must have been one of the seven named in verse 2 of this chapter as being present on the occasion. Of these seven there were three so frequently named elsewhere as intimates of Jesus on other occasions as to narrow the question to them, viz: Peter, James, and John. But it could not have been the first because he is named separately in the same connec-

tion (verse 20); neither could it have been the second because he died too early to admit of his having written the Gospel (Acts 10:11); it must therefore have been John. Ezra Abbott, in his "Critical Essays," says, "there is no trace that in Christian antiquity this title, 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' ever suggested any one but John."

CHAPTER XXV.

THE BOOK OF THE ACTS.

THE opening verse of the Acts of the Apostles offers a starting point for the consideration of its genuineness. The writer addresses himself to an individual, refers to a former treatise he had made, and specifies its contents. The facts fit the Gospel of Luke (compare the opening verses of that Gospel), and suggest immediately that the author of the one was that of the other.

Tradition is almost altogether on the side of this supposition, although there is little further internal evidence to prove it. It is clear, however, from the use of the word "we" (chapter 16:10), that the writer was a traveling companion with Paul. To be sure, Paul had several traveling companions besides Luke, and it may have been any one of these. But Luke was a physician (Col. 4:14), and an examination of both the third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles, shows the work of both to be that of a person "familiar with the language of the Greek medical schools, who naturally slipped into the use of medical phraseology." So far as this can be established, it is a very convincing evidence of the Lucan authorship of both books.

Concerning that word "we," it might be admitted that Luke wrote so much of the Acts as stands related to the employment of that pronoun, while the

remainder was the work of another man who simply incorporated Luke's account with his. But it may be asked, what is the value of such an hypothesis? While on the other hand, there seems to be a unity of plan in the book, characteristics of language and cross-references that make very strongly for a single authorship throughout.

The way in which Luke may have gathered his facts is clearly indicated by himself in the opening verses of his Gospel. He had traced all things accurately from the first in that instance, and, doubtless, he had done the same in this. He made notes as he journeyed along with Paul, supplementing them by memory, conversation and research. While this explains the data from chapter 13 to the end of the book, the previous material may have been gathered in other ways. Chapters 1 to 12 are taken up chiefly with the ministry of Peter, whom Luke may have met while sojourning with Paul at Rome. At any rate, we know that Mark "the interpreter of Peter," was with Luke in Rome, as we gather from Col. 4:10 and Philemon 24, and he could have supplied him with most of the information concerning the early events in Jerusalem because of the large place occupied by himself and his household therein (see Acts 12:12). At Caesarea again, Luke staid with Philip the Evangelist (21:8), and in Jerusalem he met James and the elders (21:18). All these doubtless supplied him with the facts he has recorded. The story in the Acts carries us down to the period of Paul's imprisonment

at Rome at about 62 or 63, but there are reasons for believing that the book was not published for perhaps 15 to 20 years later.

It is of value to note, however, that no matter who may be the human author of this compilation, its historic accuracy and truth are established in a variety of ways. There is an old, but still invaluable work by Dr. Paley, entitled "Horae Paulinae," to be obtained in second-hand book-stores at least, whose contents will astonish and delight the reader in the array of undesigned coincidences recorded as between the Acts and the Pauline epistles. Then there are later works of the same general character, like Ramsey's "The Church in the Roman Empire." An always standard book is Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of Paul." All these books note "the accuracy of the writer in the employment of official titles as well as in references to local or personal characteristics." Take an example or two. When Paul's visit to Philippi is spoken of (Acts 16:35), the local authorities are named as magistrates and sergeants, or, as the Greek indicates, "praetors" and "lictors;" but when he reaches Thessalonica the officials are "politarchs." Now the difference in these names is explained by this, that Philippi was a Roman colony while Thessalonica was a free city. The observance of this distinction is a mark of careful truth. The word "politarch," indeed, is not found in books, but has been discovered on an inscription in the city of Thessa-

lonica, which is now deposited in the British Museum.

A similar circumstance is associated with Paul's visit at Corinth. There the chief magistrate (19:12), is described as the "proconsul," (18:12, Revised Version), a title used where the Roman province was a Senatorial province. Should it be an imperial province the title would be "propraetor." Now was Corinth a senatorial province or an imperial province? Singularly enough it was the latter, both before and after Paul's visit there in 52 or 53, but during that particular period it was a senatorial province. At no other time, therefore, but that particular time could the chief magistrate have been designated correctly as the writer of Acts designates him.

It will be interesting for the reader to examine the text of that chapter in the Acts a little further, and notice that the "proconsul" of the period was Gallio. Now Seneca, the brother of this man, describes him in Roman literature as an universal favorite on account of his amiability, and it will be observed that this secular and intimate description of him tallies fully with his ruling in the case of the Jewish charges against Paul, and especially with Luke's words in verse 17, "And Gallio cared for none of these things." Such coincidences could be multiplied almost indefinitely. That there are no difficulties in reconciling two or three statements in the Acts with themselves or with statements in some of Paul's epistles one cannot un-

dertake to say, although were there time it might not be so difficult to present a reasonable explanation of them in the light of all that has been said.

It may be well to close this chapter with some words of introduction touching the epistles of Paul, which we begin to treat in the next. A familiarity with Paul's missionary journeys as recorded in the Acts, is almost a necessity to intelligently discuss the genuineness of his written productions. It will be found that there were four such journeys, taking Antioch, in Syria, as the starting point.

The first was the most limited in area, and is referred to in chapters 13:1 to 15:35. There were no epistles written on this journey of which we have any record, and, indeed, the occasion for them hardly appears.

The second journey is spoken of in Acts 15:36 to 18:22, recording the call into Europe, with the visits to Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens and Corinth, at which last-named place there is reason to believe the first and second epistles to the Thessalonians were penned, constituting them the earliest of all Paul's writings known to us.

The record of the third journey is in chapters 17:23 to 21:17, where we find him spending three years at Ephesus in Asia, and then once more crossing the Aegean and retracing his former steps in Greece. During this period were written, presumably, the first and second epistles to the Corinthians, and those to the Galatians and Romans.

The fourth journey practically concludes the his-

tory in the book and gives us the story of Paul's arrest at Jerusalem, his imprisonment at Caesarea, his shipwreck en route to Italy and his stay in the imperial city for at least two years. During this stay as a prisoner in Rome, awaiting his hearing before Caesar, he writes to the Ephesians, Colossians and Philippians, and the personal letter to Philemon. It is after his release that he addresses the first so-called pastoral epistle to Timothy, and that to Titus, but later on, when a prisoner at Rome the second time, he writes the latest of all his epistles, the second to Timothy. He is then ready to be offered, having fought the good fight, and finished his course.

CHAPTER XXVI.

PAUL'S EPISTLES—THE FIRST AND SECOND GROUPS.

WE have seen that the first group of Paul's epistles embraces only the two addressed to the church at Thessalonica, those written by him at Corinth during his second missionary journey. The story of the first is like this: Paul accompanied by Silas and Timothy, and possibly Luke, had founded the church in that city whence, after a brief stay, he had been driven out by persecution, coming down first to Berea, then to Athens and finally to Corinth. On the route, and after leaving Berea as it would appear, he sent Timothy back to Thessalonica to inquire after the welfare of the young church. The report reached him at Corinth, where he addressed this epistle to them (see Acts 17 and 18), congratulating them on their spiritual state, expressing his love for them, correcting one or two faults into which they had fallen, and especially setting them right on one important doctrinal error, viz.: the relation of the dead and the living saints at Christ's Second Coming.

The genuineness of this epistle has never been seriously attacked. There was a German scholar named Baur, head of what was called the "Tubingen School," who in the first half of the nine-

teenth century undertook to do for the New Testament what the rationalistic critics have of late sought to accomplish against the Old, but his efforts were short-lived. This critic was about the first who ever raised a word against the genuineness of Paul's first epistle to the Thessalonians. He thought its contents unimportant, aimless in some parts, also self-contradictory, and so unlike Paul. It is enough to say in the language of one of his compatriots that he has met with nothing but contradiction, and that his so-called criticisms only reveal his own ignorance of the epistle; to understand it is the best vindication of its genuineness.

There is a single remark perhaps, that should be added. In the superscription to the epistle found at the close in our King James Bibles, it is stated that it was written from Athens, which is a mistake, as the record in Acts alone would seem to indicate. These superscriptions, it should be remembered, are not part of the inspired record but the work of some human editor, whose research and scholarship are open to investigation the same as that of any ordinary writer of the present day. This can not be said of the sacred text itself, of course, but only of the superscriptions.

The second epistle soon followed the first, being written doubtless from the same city where, as we know, Paul dwelt for eighteen months. Silas and Timothy were still with Paul when he wrote the

second epistle, but after the Corinth history (Acts 18), Silas was no longer the Apostle's companion. The cause for the second epistle is on the surface. False teachers had entered in and some, indeed, had even dared to forge the name of Paul to a spurious epistle leading astray the young converts on the question of the Day of the Lord and the Second Coming of Christ (chapter 2), whom it was necessary for him to meet and answer. This forgery accomplished some good in a way, in that it caused Paul thereafter to attach a token of validity to all his epistles by which their genuineness might the more readily be established (3). The external evidence for the genuineness of this epistle, therefore, is the same as that for the former one; while as to the internal, what was said of that may be said of this, that its contents have only to be understood to be accepted as the work of Paul. See "Synthetic Bible Studies."

The next group of Paul's epistles, that associated with his third missionary journey, embraces 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Romans. On this journey Paul had passed three years at Ephesus, the story of which sojourn is found in Acts 19, (see also chapter 20). Now Corinth is just across the way from Ephesus, i. e., on the opposite shore of the Aegean Sea, the traffic and travel between the two being about as common as that between Liverpool and New York at the present time. In the church at Corinth there had been some disorders,

and questions of casuistry had arisen, and therefore the proximity of Paul was seized upon to set matters right. Messengers were sent to him with letters asking information, and verbal inquiries, to which he made reply in what we have come to denominate as his first epistle to that church (see 1:10, 11, 7:1, etc.). The genuineness of this epistle is undoubted, the witnesses for it stretching far back into antiquity, even Baur himself, referred to a moment ago, suffering it to go unchallenged.

The second epistle to this church was written not very long after the first. The Apostle had left Ephesus, however, gone up to Troas, crossed the Aegean at that point, and was somewhere in Macedonia, probably Philippi, en route to Corinth itself. See the first epistle, 16:5, for the expression of his purpose to visit that city again by this route; compare also the second epistle 2:12, 13. Paul had enemies in the church at Corinth, opponents of the Gospel as he preached it, and of the ways he used, who were seeking to undermine his authority as an apostle and contradict his teachings. It was to bring these to a more proper understanding that he had planned this second visit; "but that on his arrival he might have less cause for severity, and be better able to unite with them in sincere thanksgiving to God, he anticipates his coming by this epistle." He reminds them, for example, of "their true relations to himself and to his office," and explains the occasional severity of his first epistle on

the ground of his sincere and loving purpose to bless them in the Gospel of Christ.

Both the external and internal evidence of the genuineness of this epistle are incontestable, although some question has been raised at times as to its unity. A careful reading of the epistle will show the occasion for such a question. There have been those who thought that we had here really two epistles instead of one, although there has not been unanimity among them as to the precise divisions of the two. Some would make chapters 1-8, and chapter 13:11-13, one epistle, and the remaining chapters and verses another.

It is true, indeed, that subjects of a very different character are discussed in it, and that a different kind of spirit seems to pervade the different parts of this epistle, but in the words of a distinguished commentator, all this is sufficiently accounted for by the circumstances under which it was written. "It was composed in the midst of a journey, under overwhelming cares, by a writer of more than common sympathies, and with reference to persons as different in character and spirit as were the sincere but erring brethren at Corinth, and their corrupt and schismatical seducers." When properly considered these things make for its genuineness not only, but its unity as well.

In my judgment, of the two epistles yet to be treated of in this chapter, Galatians preceeded

Romans in time. Paul had visited Galatia, a large province of Asia Minor, on both his second and third journeys, and founded a church or churches there, though no mention is made of any particular city or town in which he labored. He is now dwelling for a while at Ephesus, (for this epistle was penned before he started for Macedonia en route to Corinth again), and while here reports reach him of false teachers who are disturbing the flock in Galatia as were others at Corinth. Their plan seemed to be much the same in both places, to undermine faith in Paul himself first, and then in the Gospel he preached, seeking to have the latter supplemented by the works of the Jewish ceremonial law. Paul addresses them, therefore, for the purpose of defending his apostolic authority in the first place, (chapters 1 and 2), and then that of the Gospel he preached, (3, 4). The genuineness of this epistle like that of the preceding ones is unquestioned, the whole church being a unit in regard to it.

Paul had not visited Rome up until this time, as is intimated in the first chapter of his epistle to the church at that place, but he had recently completed his epistle to the Galatians in which he had been led by the conditions existing there to open up the great and fundamental doctrine of justification by faith. He seems to have been possessed of a desire to enlarge upon that great truth, and Phoebe, a deaconess, being on her way to visit

Rome, (16:1, 2), he embraced the opportunity to send a letter of salutation by her using it as a means to speak more fully of that which in the other case he had only touched upon. This is the view of the origin of Romans taken by Dean Alford, in his "New Testament for English Readers," and probably as nearly correct as any. I should like to add this, however, that the difference between Galatians and Romans so far as the doctrine of justifying faith is concerned is, that the first reveals that truth from the human side, while the second does so from the divine. From the human side man is justified by believing on Jesus Christ, from the divine side he is justified by receiving as a free gift of grace the righteousness of God the instant he so believes on Jesus Christ.

The reference to Phoebe, just above, suggests that this epistle, though following closely that to the Galatians, was nevertheless, not written in Ephesus but in Corinth after Paul's second arrival there. It not only follows Galatians, therefore, but 2 Corinthians as well. The evidence for its Corinthian origin is this: In chapter 15:23-28, Paul expresses his purpose to visit Rome after first visiting Jerusalem. This we know to have been his purpose after his second visit to Corinth (Acts 19:21), a purpose subsequently carried out (Acts 24:17). Moreover, he mentions certain persons as being with him at the time of writing the epistle (16:21-23), the first three of which are known to

have been with him at Corinth (Acts 20:4), the third indeed, being his host (1:14). And finally, Phoebe herself, the bearer of the epistle, was a deaconness in the church at Cenchrea, which was the seaport of Corinth.

No serious arguments have ever been presented against the genuineness, i. e., the Pauline authorship of this epistle.

CHAPTER XXVII.

PAUL'S EPISTLES—THE THIRD GROUP.

THE third group of the Pauline Epistles is that of the period of the imprisonment—including those to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and the personal letter to Philemon. Of course, Paul had more than one imprisonment—a long one at Caesarea, as well as that at Rome (see the story of both in Acts 21-28); but the most conclusive evidence points to Rome rather than Caesarea as the place where these epistles were written. It is perhaps unnecessary for us to go into the details which prove this. There is some question, indeed, as to which of the two first-named were written the earlier, but as to this also the preponderance of opinion is in favor of the order here given.

The genuineness of Ephesians would seem to be proven by the text itself, which twice mentions Paul as its author (1:1. 3:1). Moreover, these statements are corroborated by certain data in the text bearing upon Paul's personal history. Finally the whole of the early church, heretical as well as faithful, is practically a unit in substantiating the same fact. The Baur School, and some others in the early part of the last century, ventured to question the genuineness of this epistle on the ground of its literary style and certain of its teachings, and

surmised it to have been written by some attendant or disciple of the great apostle, but their objections have all been "fairly and fully confuted."

As one has well said, "Only such a man as Paul could be the author of this epistle. If then, he is not the author, where is the spirit to be found in those times equal to him? Such a one could not walk through the world and leave no trace behind. I ask then, Who and where is he?" Indeed a spurious writer fabricating the name of Paul to such a document as this, is on the face of it, almost inconceivable and self-contradictory.

A little less certainty, but only a little less, attaches to the question as to where this epistle was sent. It is true that since the middle of the second century the whole church has called it "the Epistle to the Ephesians," and it is so stated in the first verse. But the word "Ephesus" in that verse is not found in two of the early manuscripts, the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, an omission which throws some doubt upon it, giving a slight encouragement to those who would attribute its original destination to the Laodiceans, who were in the neighborhood of the Ephesians (compare Col. 4:16). The contents of the epistle itself, however, and the apostle's relation to the church at Ephesus, go to sustain the common acceptation, the strongest objection to it on internal grounds being that it contains no personal greetings. It is scarcely possible, some think, that Paul could have writ-

ten to a church where he was so well known without sending such greetings.

But in reply to this, Professor Riddle points out that this was peculiar to Paul, and that there are fewer personal references in those epistles written by him to the churches where he was well known, than in the case of the opposite. Examine the epistles to the Galatians, Philippians and Thessalonians, churches where Paul was well known, and observe that there are practically no personal greetings in them, while in the cases of Romans and Colossians, where he was presumably unknown, there are many. Dr. Hodge thinks, and I am inclined to agree with him, that "the most probable solution of the problem is, that the epistle was written to the Ephesians and addressed to them, but being intended for the Gentile Christians as a class, rather than for the Ephesians as a church, it was designedly thrown into such a form as to suit it to all Christians in the neighboring churches, to whom, no doubt, the apostle wished it to be communicated."

This epistle is regarded with good reason as by far the most difficult of all the writings of Paul, and to quote Dean Alford, "As the wonderful effect of the Spirit of inspiration is nowhere in Scripture more evident than here, so then to discern the things of the Spirit is the spiritual mind here more than anywhere required."

As to the Epistle to the Colossians, there is no doubt as to the place where it was sent, owing to

such allusions corroborative of the salutation as are found in chapters 2:1, 4:13-16. Colossae was in the vicinity of the cities named in these passages, in the south western part of Asia Minor and in the province known as Greater Phrygia. Paul visited that region on both his second and third journeys as we learn in Acts 16-18, but nothing is said as to his being in the city of Colossae itself or founding the church there, and the probability is that such was not the case. Indeed, the text itself would lead us to believe that such was not the case, see chapter 1:3-7, 23, chapter 2:1, 5. It is true that Paul was acquainted with some of the leaders of that church, such as Epaphras and Philemon, but this might easily be accounted for on other grounds. But if it should be asked, How then shall we account for Paul's writing an epistle to a church which he did not found, we might reply by pointing to Romans, already mentioned—a church to which he wrote, but which he did not found. The church at Colossae was composed mainly of Gentile Christians, judging by the allusion in chapter 2:13, and as the Apostle to the Gentiles, Paul doubtless felt that he had a relationship and an obligation to that church which fully justified his letter.

Touching the genuineness of the epistle, the text itself specifies Paul as its author, (1.1-24; 4:18). As in the case of Ephesians it also furnishes other corroborative data, such as allusions to his suffering as an apostle (1:29), and especially as an apos-

tle to the Gentiles (4:11). It refers to that circle of companions which we know from other sources gathered around the apostle, such as Timothy, Epaphras, Tychicus, Onesimus, Luke, Mark, and Demas, and finally it deals with the same fundamental errors that are combated by Paul in other places, and "in such a way that the points of agreement and diversity are readily perceived." Indeed, the genuineness of this epistle was never doubted in ancient times, nor indeed in modern times with any measure of success. The heresies which the apostle attacks, have led the Baur School to think that possibly it was written in a post-apostolic era and when those heresies were more developed than in Paul's time, but this conjecture is unworthy of serious consideration in face of the facts already named. The germs of these heresies were in existence, earlier than the date of this epistle, and can be traced in some of Paul's writings like Romans 14:12 and Galatians 2:3-4.

The character of the Epistle to the Philippians distinguishes it in a marked way from either of the foregoing. To quote a commentator, "It is not divided as they are into a theoretical and hortatory part, but is a genuine outgush of the heart, and bears more than any other a familiar character." Its importance, aside from the one doctrinal passage, (2:5-11), lies in the province of practical life. More than once had this church contributed to the financial support of the apostle (see chapter 4:15, 16), and now they have done it again, forwarding

by a messenger their gifts to him at Rome (4:10-20). It is this last act, together with the return of Epaphroditus (chapter 2:25-30), which gave occasion for the letter.

The letter itself designates Paul as its author; represents Timothy as one of his associates; refers to his imprisonment and his former preaching in Macedonia, and gives other data like the preceding epistles to substantiate that claim. The testimony of the early church is in the same direction, so that it seems almost foolish to refer to any modern criticism of the point, which is done only as in some other instances, as a matter of literary curiosity. Baur, for example, thought the epistle to contain gnostic ideas, that is, heretical teaching of the period post-apostolic, leading him to doubt its Pauline origin. He thought too that he found an inelegant word in one place, and one or two that were forced out of place in others. There were certain historical allusions, too, very obscure indeed to the average reader, which he thought to be post-Pauline, but in reference to all these things, those in whose judgment we may repose the utmost confidence assure us that when properly understood, they become voucher for the genuineness of the epistle instead of arguments against it.

According to chapter 1:7, 13-20 and chapter 4:22, Paul was a prisoner when he wrote this epistle, but with freedom not only to write, but to preach. It is evident that he had been in that situation also for some time. His references to the imperial pal-

ace, moreover, indicate, as we have already stated, that the place of his imprisonment was Rome.

The letter to Philemon was written at the same time, and sent to the same place and makes mention of the same persons as Colossians. The early church amply attests its genuineness, and from the internal point of view, "it is strongly marked by those incidental relations of thought and expression which indicate an author's hand. It contains but ten words not found in his other writings."

This last-named circumstance, however, strange to say, has been seized upon by some modern critics to disprove the Pauline authorship rather than to prove it, as if a writer having produced two or three compositions must thereafter confine himself to the very same vocabulary in all his subsequent productions, no matter what his subject or how long the time intervening between his writings. Professor Hackett well says: "This is hypercriticism, betraying a morbid sensibility to doubt."

The internal evidence of genuineness, marked by these relationships of thought and expression, is corroborated in a most interesting manner by many historical allusions, in which the apostle refers to events in his own life or to other persons with whom he was connected, and which harmonize perfectly with similar statements or incidental allusions in his other epistles or in the Acts.

The occasion for the epistle is easily discernible from the text. Onesimus was a slave of Philemon, a Christian master, and had fled out of fear of pun-

ishment, because, presumably, of a theft he had committed. He comes into contact with Paul at Rome and is won to Jesus Christ. Paul is now sending his fellow-laborer Tychicus to Ephesus and Colossae with a letter to those churches, and avails himself of the opportunity to send back Onesimus to Philemon, whom he commends at the same time to the church at Colossae. He also gives the slave this letter to secure him a kind reception on the part of Philemon, and if possible, a remission of his punishment.

The entire story reads so much like a romance that it has been difficult for some to believe it to be true, and yet profane history has a parallel related in one of the letters of the younger Pliny; although, as scholars have pointed out, the communication of Paul is very much the superior of the two, "not only in the spirit of Christianity, of which Pliny was ignorant, but in dignity of thought, argument, beauty of style and eloquence."

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

THE fourth and last group of the Pauline writings is known commonly as the Pastoral Epistles, and consists of the two to Timothy and that to Titus. They are called "Pastoral" because they are addressed to young pastors and deal, not with the great questions of doctrine and philosophy except incidentally, but with the practical matters of the pastoral and ministerial office.

Their genuineness has been questioned more than that of any other writings of Paul on the ground of peculiarities in the phraseology and because that matters of church polity are discussed in a way to indicate a later period of ecclesiastical development, than that of his time; but as the early church received them without question, and as all the peculiarities and other matters mbay readily be explained by difference of time, subject and other circumstances, there need be no hesitation on our part to receive them as well.

It is to be hoped that the preceding chapters have made clear that the question of the genuineness of any of these writings is not identical with that of its inspiration or authority, but only touches its authorship. These epistles may not have been written by Paul, but by some other inspired

writer and yet have just the same interest and authority for us, although it must be confessed that the thought of the Pauline authorship is so bound up with them, that to see good evidence to doubt it, would lead one to doubt them. But such evidence, as we have said, does not exist.

Timothy, to whom two of these epistles are addressed, was probably a native of Lystra or Derbe (Acts 16:1), the son of a Jewish mother and Greek father, who had received a thorough training in the Old Testament Scriptures (2 Tim. 1:5; 2 Tim 3: 14-15). He was probably converted to Jesus Christ under Paul's ministry on the occasion of the first visit of Paul to his neighborhood (Acts 14; 1 Tim. 1:2), and chosen to be his traveling companion and assistant on his second visit. In this capacity he probably continued with more or less interruption until after Paul's release from his first imprisonment at Rome (for Paul seems to have suffered another imprisonment later than that recorded in the Acts), when he left Timothy at Ephesus, he himself being en route to Macedonia.

At Ephesus Timothy seems to have filled the office of bishop or overseer of the church or churches (1 Tim. 1:3), where he labored, apparently, until Paul during his second imprisonment called him again to Rome (2 Tim. 4:21). Later on, he himself seems to have been cast into prison, though when, where or why, we do not know (Heb. 13:23). and tradition has it that he suffered martyrdom somewhere near the close of the second century.

Timothy is everywhere spoken of in terms of praise and as possessing many gifts and graces, but his apparent youth (1 Tim. 4:12), and state of health (1 Tim. 5:23), superadded doubtless to the trying situation in the church of Ephesus everywhere touched upon in the two epistles addressed to him, made it necessary for Paul to admonish him again and again.

From these admonitions we gather that Timothy was a man of a somewhat timid, perhaps weak or wavering disposition, requiring constant spurs to activity, although there are those who would disagree in this opinion about him. It is a question, however, which any reader of the Acts and the epistles of Paul may determine for himself.

As to the first epistle, Paul was on the road from Ephesus to Macedonia when he wrote it (1:3), but, as already intimated, this does not refer to the journey spoken of in Acts 20, after the uproar in the theater, but a much later one, following his liberation from the Roman imprisonment, and not narrated in the Acts.

The contents of the epistle show progress and development in ecclesiastical affairs which demand a certain lapse of time from the so-called prison epistles to account for them, bringing us perhaps to A. D. 64 or 65. Heretical teachers had arisen, and Timothy was young and needed counsel for his conduct and encouragement. He needed also a public testimony from the great apostle to the agreement of their respective teachings. This ex-

plains the epistle from the human point of view, but from the divine point of view we may feel assured that the Holy Spirit was thinking of and caring for the wants of the church in coming generations, as well as in that place and time.

This does not mean that we have here expressed the fixed forms in which church polity must always move from century to century in all lands, but it does mean that here we are to find the great, unchangeable, fundamentals which govern them.

The epistle to Titus intervenes before the second to Timothy. Titus is not named in the Acts, and what we learn of him is incidentally mentioned in the Pauline epistles. He was by birth a Greek (Gal. 2:3), and converted to Christianity under Paul (Titus 1:4). He traveled with Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem on the occasion of the first great council, (Acts 15; Gal. 2), and afterwards with Paul in certain of his missionary journeys. The apostle frequently names him in terms of commendation, several times indeed in the second epistle to Corinthians, chapters 7-12.

At the time of this epistle we do not know the whereabouts of Paul, but Titus was in Crete, an island in the Mediterranean, near the mouth of the Aegean, where he had been left by Paul for much the same reason as Timothy at Ephesus (1:5), although it is not as easy to determine when this may have taken place. Some imagine it to have been after Paul's first imprisonment as in the other case. Titus joined Paul in Rome afterward,

as there is reason to believe (2 Tim. 4:10); and was with him doubtless in his second imprisonment, although tradition relates that he died and was buried in Crete at the age of 94.

Titus had a difficult task in Crete, for the people are described to be "unsteady, insincere, quarrelsome, and given to licentiousness and intemperance." It was therefore necessary for Titus to be prepared and strengthened for the contest evidently before him by having in his hands the written instructions to which he might appeal and in proof that he was acting in accordance with apostolic mandates. But, as Calvin states, and any reader of the epistle will perceive, it was written scarcely more for Titus himself than for the church as well.

The second letter to Timothy was written when Paul was in prison the second time and saw his martyrdom at hand. That it is not the time of his first imprisonment is shown in the fact that Mark is not present with him (chapter 4:11), though he was with him during the earlier imprisonment (Col. 4:10). Nor was Timothy with him now although he had been with him previously (Phil. 1:1). Timothy is now at Ephesus where he was on the occasion of the first epistle, and this is sent to him for the purpose of encouraging him in the performance of his duties, and also acquainting him with the condition of the apostle in view of his approaching end, and to urge him to come to see him as soon as possible and bring Mark with him.

The tone of the epistle is even more natural and

affectionate than the former one, and while the apostle still inveighs against the false teachers, he is speaking now more than formerly "in the tender grief of a departing father." The mention of many individuals is an internal evidence of genuineness, and without any extended argument, the epistle may be said to be"a self-evident and lasting authority for the martyrdom of the great apostle." Van Oosterzee, from whom the last two sentences are quoted, speaks of it, and truly, as "a treasure to the Christian church of all ages, and a noble crown to Paul's earlier testimony."

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

WE ARE accustomed to consider the epistle to the Hebrews as a work of Paul, but it may be questioned whether the claim is tenable. You will notice that the name of no author is given in the book itself, while that in the title, as found in some of our Bibles, is simply a human suggestion and not a divine authorization. Hebrews, indeed, like Romans, is more of a treatise than an epistle or a personal letter, since it begins with no greetings and contains no messages or salutations to individuals. Its aim is simply to furnish an argument in favor of one definite proposition. Moreover, it is addressed to no particular church, although there are not wanting evidences in the tone of certain passages to indicate that such must have been the case originally, and that the church addressed was not composed of Gentile but Jewish converts to Christianity.

Whoever these Jewish Christians were, they had been subjected to severe persecutions, causing a weakening of their faith and creating a desire to return to the rest and ease, to say nothing of the pomp and glory of their old religion of Judaism. It is clear that Jerusalem and the temple were still standing and the elaborate Mosaic ceremonial in operation, which contributed, doubtless, to the

power of their temptation. The proof of this is founded on the use of the present tense in speaking of the temple services (9:6-7; 10:1, etc.), and, indeed, on the whole scope of the argument. If Jerusalem and the temple had been destroyed at the time, it would have done away with the immediate object of the epistle, because it would have done away with the chief temptation to apostatize to Judaism. This temptation, therefore, was not merely to supplement the faith of the Gospel by the works of the law, as in the case of the Gentile Galatians, but to apostatize altogether and give up Christianity for their old faith. This faith had been introduced by the prophets and spoken by angels; it was associated with the greatness of Moses and the splendor of the Aaronic priesthood; it was hard, therefore, to turn their backs upon it for the substitute offered by a poor, rejected, and crucified carpenter of Nazareth.

The inspired writer meets the situation in a very simple and tactful way by demonstrating once for all, the superiority of Christianity over Judaism. There were many ways in which this might have been done, but only one is selected, namely, the superiority of Christianity as seen in its Founder, Christ. He was superior to the prophets, to the angels, to Moses, to Aaron.

Between these different parts of his argument, the writer interjects appeals and warnings against apostasy, with glowing exhortations to steadfastness in the faith.

The above allusion to the epistle to the Galatians suggests an interesting contrast between the two, which others have pointed out, and which, indeed, is quite apparent to any careful reader. In the first-named epistle, Paul is demonstrating that the law of Moses is not binding upon Gentiles, and that it possessed simply a transitory or intermediate position between the original promise to Abraham and its fulfillment in Christ. He therefore treats the question polemically, using expressions now and again calculated to wound the vanity and arouse the opposition of Jewish readers. But the author of Hebrews pursues a different tack. He is dealing with Judaism, "not as a law but as a system of worship," and while showing the superiority of the new religion to the old, is able at the same time to do so without detracting from the old. He shows Christianity to be a development of Judaism, of which it is an antitype. If Judaism had its glory, therefore, and he admits its glory, how much greater must be that of Christianity.

The authorship of this epistle is scarcely more of a mystery than its destination, some supposing it to have been sent to the church at Jerusalem, some to Alexandria and some to Rome. The advocates of the place last-named would lay stress upon the salutation in chapter 13:4, "They of Italy salute you," but it must be evident that such an expression might have been used in addressing any city in the world, since there must have been

Christians everywhere whose home had once been in Italy.

But the most interesting question concerning this epistle is that of its human author, who, as already intimated, can hardly be Paul. There are several arguments for this, well marshalled in any of the cyclopedic articles on the subject and in the introductions to the book found in the different commentaries, but that of Dean Farrar in the "Cambridge Bible," from which we quote an expression here and there, is particularly full and interesting. For example, one argument against the Pauline authorship is the great difference in style between the epistle to the Hebrews and Paul's writings generally When Paul's emotions are stirred he writes with a fervid eloquence that never pauses to round a period, while the writer in this case seems to delight in amplifications and euphonious expressions, possessing more literary self-control. To quote Farrar, "The rhetoric of this writer resembles the flow of a river, while that of Paul, the rush of a mountain torrent amid opposing rocks."

A second argument is found in the source of the quotations from the Old Testament. Paul in his writings usually quotes from the Hebrew manuscripts, while this writer follows the Septuagint version, even when it differs somewhat from the Hebrew.

In the next place, while, of course, the writer of this epistle agrees with Paul on all the doctrines of the Gospel, yet he handles them with a different

terminology. Paul generally speaks of the Savior as "Our Lord Jesus Christ," or "Christ Jesus, our Lord," while this writer usually refers to him as "Jesus," or "The Lord," or "Christ." In all the thirteen epistles of Paul the words "priest" and "high priest" do not occur, while here they are mentioned thirty-two times.

Paul, in speaking of the redemptive work of Christ dwells continually upon the mysteries of his death as an expiatory sacrifice, while this writer simply assuming all that Paul has written on that subject, refers simply to the fact that Christ offered himself as a sacrifice, without adding any explanation or comment upon it. Paul uses the word "justification" to describe the result of Christ's work toward the believer, but this writer uses the word, or its equivalent, "righteousness" in its simple and original sense of moral rectitude. Another feature is spoken of as its Alexandrian (Egypt) character, and the resemblances it contains to the writings of Philo, the chief Jewish philosopher of the Alexandrian school of thought—a line of suggestion hardly within the scope of this chapter to pursue. More important for us is the knowledge that while the Eastern or Asiatic church gave a certain currency to the belief in the Pauline authorship on the ground of superficial points of resemblance, the early Western church seems to have known that it did not belong to Paul. Not a single writer in the Western church for the first three centuries attributes it to Paul, and even as late as the sev-

enth century we find traces of hesitation in so ascribing it although at this time "a loose habit had sprung up of quoting it as his."

Who then, was its author? "From the epistle itself," thus says Farrar, "we gather with almost a certainty the following facts: That the writer was a Jew; that he was a Grecian Jew; familiar with the writings of Philo; 'an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures;' a friend of Timothy; not an apostle but one who had been taught by the apostles (2:3); acquainted with the teachings of Paul and harmonious therewith; writing before the destruction of Jerusalem." From all of these facts the author just mentioned assumes the writer of the epistle to have been Apollos, who he thinks meets all the requirements. He is not alone in this judgment, but is in the company of an ever increasing line of scholars. We do well to remember, however, that this is only an inference after all, and we cannot be accused of prejudice or blind ignorance if, notwithstanding, we should continue to speak of the epistle as the work of Paul, as the present writer finds himself doing very frequently from the force of habit at least.

It is a comfort to know that notwithstanding the doubt as to the authorship of this book, its canonicity is attested beyond question, resting on the fact that it has been accepted from the earliest time both by the Eastern and Western churches.

CHAPTER XXX.

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES.

WE HAVE now reached that part of the New Testament containing the General or Catholic epistles. They are so called because they are addressed not to any particular individual or church, but to the church at large. And yet this is not true of all of them, as we shall see, giving us an opportunity to remark that this general title, like the headings to the chapters in our English Bible, and the superscriptions in italics at the end of some of the books are not part of the inspired text, and have no authority but that of the human printer or editor—often not to be relied upon, as in the present case.

To begin with the authorship of the first of these epistles, there are three persons named James mentioned in the New Testament. One was the brother of John, another the son of Alpheus, and a third the brother of our Lord. The first named was martyred at an early date in the history of the church (Acts 12), and is not likely to have been the author, because, although the epistle is doubtless of an early date, yet it reveals a state of Christian or church development more advanced than that likely to have been true then. Nor is it likely to have been written by the son of Alpheus, for nothing is heard of him in the later history of the church,

while the James who wrote this epistle is evidently well known and influential, a fact which was also true, it would seem, of James the brother of our Lord. It is he, apparently, who presided at the first council of the church in Jerusalem (Acts 15), and who is distinguished in other places as a leader, notably Acts 12:17, 21:18, Gal. 1:19, Jude 1, etc.

A peculiar interest attaches to the fact that, as the brother of our Lord, he did not believe on him as the Messiah up until the resurrection perhaps. Compare John 7:5 with Acts 1:13, and 1 Corinthians 15:7. His conversion may have taken place at the time mentioned in the last named Scripture, which, if so, accounts for his presence with the church as shown in the reference to the Acts. Tradition teaches us that he was a particularly holy and just man, being designated indeed, "James the Just;" and that he ended his life in martyrdom, being stoned to death under one of the high priests, some time after the death of Festus mentioned in the Acts.

As to his religious character, he was a very strict Jew, a faithful observer of the law, both moral and ceremonial, without, of course, relying upon it as a ground of salvation. He gave Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship in their work among and for the Gentiles, but personally he remained more firmly attached to the Jewish form or aspect of Christianity. His place in the Christian scheme was to win over the Jewish people, and no one probably was better fitted for this than he.

The epistle is addressed "to the twelve tribes scattered abroad," which proves its Jewish designation; but that they were Christian Jews nevertheless is shown in the further language of the salutation, where James styles himself "a servant of Jesus Christ." There are several indications in the epistle of their Jewish origin, however; for example, their place of assembly is called a "synagogue," (2:2, Revised Version), and there are several references to the law.

As to their social condition they seem to have been composed of rich and poor, the tendency of some of the former being both to oppress and despise the latter. Like all the other classes of Christians, they were passing through trials of various kinds, and like them, too, they were more or less under the influence of false teachers. The doctrine of justification only by faith was especially being perverted among them, and from various points of view, indeed, their condition was disclosed as quite unsatisfactory. The writer comforts them in their trials, but he sternly rebukes them for their sins, and seeks throughout to give them much needed instruction concerning the matters in which they were in error.—(Quoted from "Synthetic Bible Studies.")

There are indications, as already intimated, that this epistle was written at an early date, perhaps the earliest of all the epistles. For example, no reference is made to the council at Jerusalem (Acts 15), which would have been likely to have been

done had it yet taken place. Moreover, the epistle contains no recognition at all of any Gentile Christians, while the word "synagogue" is the only one employed to designate a place of Christian worship. These circumstances are not convincing, of course, but suggestive.

The canonicity of the epistle is firmly established. While at first, it was questioned in the Western church, I believe, yet the Eastern received it from the beginning, and at an early date, comparatively speaking, it was universally recognized.

CHAPTER XXXI.

THE GENERAL EPISTLES OF PETER AND JUDE.

THE second of the authors of the so-called "General" epistles in the order of our Bibles is Peter, for whose personal history it is only necessary to examine such passages as John 1:35-42; Mark 2:29, 30; Matthew 4:18-22, 16:13-23, 26:57-75. Acts, chapters 1-12, and Galatians 2:11-21. Of the latter part of his life nothing is definiely known, although tradition holds that after his visit to Antioch mentioned in the Scripture last referred to, he remained at Jerusalem some years, then visited Syria and the Asiatic provinces mentioned in his first epistle, (where he wrote that epistle), afterwards going to Rome where he was crucified in the reign of Nero, according to the prediction shadowed forth in John 21:18, 19.

The question of Peter's visiting Rome, however, is one still open to very earnest dispute; Roman Catholics alleging that he was the founder of the church there, actually residing in that city for twenty-five years; others denying that he ever visited the city at all; while a third class maintains the position indicated in the former paragraph. That Peter was not the founder of the church of Rome, however, would seem to be almost necessitated by

Paul's words in Romans 1:8-15, compared with his declaration in 2 Corinthians 10:15, 16.

The destination of the first epistle as indicated in the opening verse, suggests that of James dealt with in the preceding chapter. These "strangers" were doubtless "sojourners of the dispersion," i. e., Jewish Christians for the most part, scattered abroad in these various provinces, although some Gentiles were also distributed among them as we may judge by such allusions as 1:14, 4:3, etc.

The place where the epistle was written seems to have been Babylon (5:13), which some writers, chiefly Roman Catholics, have affected to apply, mystically, to Rome. There is, however, no conclusive evidence that at the time the epistle was written such a title as "Babylon" was ever given to Rome, although afterwards ecclesiastical writers accepted it, basing their opinion on certain allusions to Babylon in the book of Revelation, (as, for example, in the fourteenth chapter).

Late interpretations of this mysterious book of Revelation are increasingly in favor of the idea that Babylon therein means the ancient city of that name, revived in the last days, preparatory to the final judgment falling upon her, in the fulfilment of the early prophecies in Isaiah and Jeremiah. But at the time of the Reformation, and incident thereto, the interpretation was all the other way, and Babylon was none other than Rome, whose judgment for her wicked treatment of the saints was soon to be executed.

It was this that gave countenance on the part of Protestants to the old time holding of the Roman Catholics that Babylon in 1 Peter may have meant Rome. But as we have intimated, there is no good reason why such a figurative name should have been given to it in the time of Peter, while as another pointedly says, "such a piece of symbolism is plainly unsuited to epistolary writing."

The general object of the epistle is stated by its author in 5:12, as that of "exhorting and testifying" concerning "the true grace of God." This "true grace of God" is revealed practically in the first twelve verses of the epistle which conclude the doctrinal part, the remainder being given to the application of the truth in those verses. Another way to analyze the epistle is to style its theme "The Living Hope and its Obligations." The "living hope" is set before us in the doctrinal verses referred to; and the obligations follow to the end of the epistle. Happily, no doubt has ever existed from the beginning as to the genuineness or canonicity of this book.

The same cannot be said, however, of the second epistle of this same author, which was not mentioned by any of the earliest Christian writers. The reason for the doubt as to its authorship is found altogether in the differences of its tone and style from that of the first epistle, but this reason is hardly conclusive in view of the points of resemblance between the two epistles which may easily be discovered, and also in view of the fact that the

second epistle is treating of an entirely different subject from the first and in an entirely different way. "The first epistle is chiefly hortatory, the second polemical." Furthermore, while the earliest Christian writers do not mention the epistle, the later writers do, i. e., those of the fourth century, all of whom attribute it to Peter, and all of whom had better opportunity for original investigation of the matter than have we today.

The second epistle seems to have been addressed to the same persons as the first (see chapter 3); but while the first was, to a great extent, an exhortation to patience under trial and suffering, the second is an exhortation to fidelity and "perseverance in the truth amidst prevailing error." It is interesting to note, too, that this prevailing error related to the second coming of Christ which the scoffers of that early period denied, as do their successors in our own time.

"Among the peculiarities of this epistle is a remarkable resemblance of certain passages, especially in the second chapter, to the epistle of Jude; from which it is impossible to resist the conclusion, either that one writer quoted from the other, or both from a common source." Some think Jude was the original and some think Peter, but it is impossible to determine the point nor is it essential.

Speaking of Jude, we feel led to incorporate our allusions to him in this chapter, somewhat out of his proper place, in order to devote the following one to the concluding writings of John.

While Jude describes himself as the brother of James he omits to designate which James, and we have seen in a previous chapter that there were three leading personages of that name in the apostolic church. There was indeed an apostle by the name of Jude, other than Judas Iscariot, but this could hardly have been he, it is thought, because he would have so designated himself rather than as brother of James. Verse 17 also intimates that he was not an apostle. Most commentators or expositors regard him as the brother of James the author of the epistle, and hence as being himself, like that James, one of the brothers of our Lord, but nothing further is known concerning him.

The epistle seems to be addressed to Christians in general, though it contains so many allusions to the contents of the Old Testament as to suggest that Jews rather than Gentiles may have been especially in mind. For such allusions see verses 5, 7, 11, etc. The epistle is notable also for its non-Biblical or rather extra-Biblical allusions (see verses 2 and 14 particularly). These allusions are to Jewish apocalyptic books of about the time of Christ or a little earlier, and while such books cannot be classed as canonical or inspired for reasons already given in this work, yet the quotations from or allusions to their contents, herein indicated, take on all that character because of their employment by the pens of those who were as truly inspired to quote from truth or fact elsewhere expressed as to express themselves in an original

form. The canonicity or genuineness of Jude may be accepted without question. Similar objections may be raised against it as have appeared in connection with other of the epistles treated heretofore, but the replies would be practically of the same character as well.

CHAPTER XXXII.
THE EPISTLES AND REVELATION OF JOHN.

THE last of the General epistles are the first, second and third of John, to which for the purpose of this concluding chapter of part I., we shall add the book of Revelation written by the same author.

But how do we know that the so-called First Epistle of John was written by that apostle? His name is not prefixed to it, indeed, but it has always been attributed to him nevertheless, from the earliest times, and this, as much as for any other reason, because of the remarkable similarity of its style and contents to the fourth Gospel. It is very evident, in any event, that it must have been written by an eyewitness of the earthly life of our Lord (1:1-4; 4:14, etc.), although the nature of the doctrinal errors it condemns indicates that the date of its writing must have been in an advanced period of the development of the church, possibly the last decade of the first century.

Those doctrinal errors seem to have been of a three-fold character—all centering in the Person of our Lord. There were those who already denied the deity of Christ, others who denied his humanity, and still a third class who denied the union of

the two natures in the one Person from the beginning of his life in the flesh. The first are attacked in such passages as 2:22, 4:15, 5:1; the second in 1:1-3, 4:3, 5:6; while the third are met in the harmonization of these apparent contradictory teachings.

But, of course, while the offsetting of these errors may have been the governing reasons for the writing of the epistle, yet its contents include much more. The theme of the whole as stated by the writer himself in the first chapter, is that of "Fellowship with God," and it is beautiful, indeed, to observe the manner in which the theme is wrought out. Three definitions of God are given, Light, Righteousness, and Love, and it is shown that fellowship with him involves one's walking in the light, doing righteousness, and experiencing and manifesting love. The whole idea is worked out more fully in the author's "Synthetic Bible Studies."

The epistle is not addressed to any particular church or individual, but there are internal reasons for regarding it as meant for Gentile Christians chiefly, and doubtless in the region of Asia Minor where John himself labored. See chapter 2, verse 7, 12-14, and 20-27.

The second epistle is addressed to "the elect lady," although some would render it "the elect Kyria," making the last word a proper name. She was some Christian mother of prominence in the church, dwelling at Ephesus it may be, and prob-

ably a widow, since no mention is made of her husband. The letter is addressed to her and her children for the purpose of encouraging them in the truth and strengthening them against false teachers. While it is not stated therein that it was written by John, or even an apostle, but "the elder" or "presbyter," yet there has never been any question in the church as to the identity of its source with that of the first epistle. Indeed, nearly three-fifths of its contents are identical in substance with that epistle, leading an able expositor to say in substance, that "both epistles (the second and the third), present such an affinity with the first, both generally and in particulars, as to lead us to attribute them to the same writer. This affinity can not be explained as an imitation. Moreover the little that is peculiar to the whole three as distinct from the Gospel of John, is not of a character to warrant the supposition that they have come from a different hand, and is far outweighed by the points of resemblance."

Gaius, or Caius, was the name of the individual saint to whom the third epistle was addressed. Perhaps he was the same one mentioned in Romans 11:23 and 1 Corinthians 1:14, and yet the name was not an uncommon one, and he may have been another person altogether. It has always been attributed to the apostle John, practically without any dispute. Its contents also are of interest outside of their immediate application, from the insight

they afford of the church life in the closing years of the apostolic age.

The Apocalypse, or Revelation, states in the first verse that its human means of communication to man was John, and although it is not stated that this was the apostle John, yet any other supposition has never seriously been contended for. There was an hypothesis, as old as the fourth century, that it might be ascribed to a "Presbyter John," perhaps a contemporary of the apostle, and living in the second century, but it is now, I believe, regarded as altogether untenable.

But while there is practically no dispute as to the author, there is nevertheless, quite a difference of opinion as to the date when Revelation was written. The text of the first chapter informs us that the author was an exile on Patmos in the Aegean Sea at the time of some (Roman) persecution, and it seems impossible to determine absolutely whether this was in the reign of Nero in the sixties, or that of Domitian in the nineties. Ireneus, one of the Christian fathers, who died A. D. 170, explicitly places it in the latter reign, while Tertullian, 50 years subsequently, assigns it by tradition to the former. A strong argument in favor of the tradition is the difference in language or style between the Revelation and the Gospel of John, so great as to be "explained only by the Gospel having been a later work by many years," for the Gospel is in smooth and beautiful Greek compared with the Revelation which is very rugged, "Hebrew and

Greek constructions being intermingled very strangely."

The Gospel, it is thought, and this is true also of the three epistles of John, must have been penned after a long residence in Ephesus "amid the influence of Greek culture and civilization," while the Revelation bears more of the marks of the Galilean fisherman. The reference also to Jerusalem and the temple in chapter 2, seems to imply their existence when Revelation was written, which would place the date before 70.

Much may be said, however, in favor of the later date which, in my opinion, is the correct one. One argument is the advanced stage of ecclesiastical development as shown in the condition of the churches addressed in the first three chapters. Another is the use of the phrase "The Lord's Day," as distinguishing the first day of the week, which was the designation of the earlier time. A third is the evidence of a more general state of persecution which these same epistles to the churches present as compared with what we know to have been the case in the sixties.

We cannot undertake to give anything of an outline of this mysterious book, for which the reader is referred to the author's earlier work alluded to above. But it may be well to add this, that the more study and reflection he bestows upon it, the more is he persuaded that, excepting the first three chapters, the book is largely Jewish in its application, and is to find its fulfilment in a comparative-

brief period of time, known in the prophet Daniel as the last of the seventy weeks, or the culmination of the present age. The Jews will have been restored to their own land in that day, though still in an unconverted state, and the Gentile nations of the Roman world will be gathered against them under the leadership of the Anti-Christ. The judgments depicted in the book are those which are to fall on Israel in part, on those Gentile nations, and on that Wicked One who is at the head of them. It is at the close of these events that the Millennium is introduced upon the earth as indicated in the twentieth chapter.

PART II

How We Know the Bible is Credible

INTRODUCTORY

IN Part I of this series of "Primers of the Faith," we undertook to show the grounds on which we may believe in the genuineness of the Bible. The question before us then was preliminary, and covered this single point, namely, as to whether the books of the Old and New Testaments were written by the authors to whom they are ascribed, and whether their contents are in all material points the same as when they came from their hands.

We may now assume to be satisfied that Moses, Samuel, David, Solomon, Isaiah, Daniel, Ezra, John, Paul, and all the others, really wrote those books and that we have before us the subject matter that they wrote. But, as has been stated in another place, a book may be genuine as to its authorship, and yet not be credible as to its contents. Any work of fiction illustrates this. We have the books of Dickens, George Eliot, Washington Irving, and J. Fennimore Cooper, for example, and are quite satisfied that they wrote them, and that we have the material as it came from their pens, but at the same time, we place little or no confidence in their statements of fact. Is this, in any sense, true of the Bible, or may we believe that it is credible as well as genuine?

The chapters to follow are intended to show how we know the Bible is credible, and that it may be

depended upon in its statements of fact. We shall not cover all the ground that may be included in the proof of its credibility, or even allude to all of it in our limited space, but, as in Part I, we hope to be able to offer suggestions and hints, satisfactory for the time, and stimulating to further study and research. It may, indeed, be fairly assumed that the genuineness of the Bible carries with it the evidence of its credibility, and yet, this is not true so absolutely as to make the separate consideration of its credibility altogether unnecessary.

Writers of Christian Evidences have sometimes divided the proof of the truth of the Bible into the external or historical evidences, and the internal or moral evidences. The first division would include such features as the existence of the Bible itself as an historical fact; the need of such a revelation as the Bible in the light of the existence of a personal God, and the erroneous opinions and wicked practices of men; the miracles wrought in attestation of its claims; the fulfillment of its prophecies; the effects of its teaching in the history of individuals and nations; and the contemporaneous records of the world.

The internal or moral evidences would include the moral character of the precepts of the Bible; the adaptation of its contents to the deepest needs of man; the conception of Jesus Christ which it contains; the union and harmony of its several parts; and the comparison of the religion which it reveals with the natural religions of the world.

As already intimated, these chapters will not necessarily follow this plan or treat of all these subjects, but selections from them here and there will be made.

PART II.

How We Know the Bible is Credible

CHAPTER I.

THE BIBLE AS A HISTORIC FACT.

THE writer has always felt that one of the strongest evidences of the credibility or truth of the Bible is the Bible itself, by which he means the fact of its existence as a historical reality. How it got into the world and how it has maintained itself in the world, carries with it an almost incontrovertible witness that it is true. The more one thinks about this, the larger it looms up upon his mental horizon.

In this respect, it is always to be kept in mind that Christianity, of which the Bible is the exponent, is a historical religion both in its origin and development, and is, therefore, brought into visible contact with contemporaneous facts. For example, the Old Testament is largely the history of a single nation, including, of course, its relations to contemporaneous nations. In the case of the New Testament, the Gospels and the Acts are historical and biographical, and although the Epistles are chiefly doctrinal, yet even they have a historical setting, and come in contact more or less with outside events of their own time.

"It is the historic feature which distinguishes Christianity from all the other religions in the world. They are speculative, this is tangible; they are founded on fancy, this on absolute fact. The writers of the Bible declare what they have seen and heard and challenge secular history either to refute or confirm their testimony." (Henry M. King, D. D., in "Why We Believe the Bible.")

Because of this distinguishing feature of Christianity it is possible to show that the very existence of the Bible as a historical fact is a proof of its credibility and that of the religion it reveals. To demonstrates this, we may limit ourselves to the existence of the New Testament, and indeed to that of the Gospels. If the New Testament be shown to be true, it carries with it the same demonstration for the Old Testament, of which it is in one sense simply the fruit, (see Matthew 5:17; Luke 24:44; John 10:35; Romans 3:31; Hebrews 1:1-2). On the other hand, if the Gospels be true, there is nothing in any other part of the New Testament to inspire doubt. If one desires to see this thought wrought out in detail, in rhetoric as beautiful as its logic is convincing, he may be referred to Bishop McIlvaine's, "Evidences of Christianity," to which indebtedness is acknowledged for part of the following:

For example, that the historical existence of the Gospels is a presumptive evidence of their truth is seen in four ways:—

First, by the facts of their publication.

Second, by the circumstantiality of their records.

Third, by the testimony of their opponents.

Fourth, by the testimony of contemporaneous writings.

To elaborate the first point, it is to be remembered that the synoptics at least, were published within thirty years or thereabouts, after the resurrection and ascension of our Lord. This was the very period in which the events were said to have occurred. Moreover, they were published in the locality where the events transpired, and among a people who thus had every facility, as well as every reason, to sift the truthfulness of their claims. The great Dr. Channing has said, "A history received by a people as true, not only gives us the testimony of the writer, but that of the nation in which it finds credit." Tried by this canon, the Gospels assuredly demonstrate their credibility. Moreover, sane men, whether of bad character or good, would not have published such books, under such circumstances, expecting them to be accepted as true if they were false.

As to the second point, it has been well said that "generality is a cloak of fiction." False witnesses always avoid details which multiply opportunities for detection. But the Gospels are very full of details. Incidents are described with the utmost particularity as to time, persons, and places. One has only to recall the stories of the raising of Lazarus (John 11), and the son of the widow of Nain (Luke 7), to be impressed with this. Moreover, no as-

tonishment is shown in the relation of the most marvelous events. Mysteries are never sought to be explained. What inference may be drawn from this, if not that the events were too well known to admit of contradiction? Bishop McIlvaine points out also, that the things most discreditable to the writers themselves are mentioned without the slightest effort of concealment, (Matthew 15:16; Matthew 16:8, 23; Mark 10:35-37; Mark 14:50; Luke 17:5; etc.). Nor should we forget that they suffered persecution and death for their testimony, of which they had been fully warned, (Matthew 24:9; John 16:2; Acts 12:1-3; 1 Corinthians 4:9-14).

As to the third point, many who rejected the claims of Christianity itself, admitted the facts on which those claims were based. The Pharisees did this in Christ's time, (Matthew 12:24; 17:54; John 3:1-2; John 7:31-46). Infidels of the post-apostolic age did this, as for example, Celsus in the second century, Porphyry in the third, and Julian, the apostate emperor, in the fourth.

As to the fourth point, contemporaneous writers, both Jewish and heathen, corroborate the statements of the Gospels, as far as it comes within their purpose to refer to them. This is true of Josephus, the Jewish historian. (A. D. 37 to 93); Tacitus, the Roman historian (A. D. 100); Pliny, the Roman governor of Bithynia (A. D. 103); Suetonius, a writer of biographical sketches, (A. D. 117); and Juvenal, a writer of satires (A. D. 128). To this list might be added the great name

of the later historian of Rome, Edward Gibbon. Though his infidelity made it almost impossible for him to be just in his treatment of the Christian religion, yet he records enough concerning it to fully establish the credence with which the Gospels were received at the time of their publication, and to substantiate the present claim of the historical existence of the Bible as a proof of its credibility. Indeed, to this claim might be added the further one that its continued existence in the face of greater light on the one hand, and greater opposition on the other, is a continued proof of the same fact. Should the reader desire to see this last thought elaborated further, he is referred to the India lectures of Dr. Barrows, "Christianity, the World Religion," page 158 et seq.

CHAPTER II.

EVIDENCE OF THE PICK-AXE AND THE SPADE.

IN OUR opening chapter we sought to prove the credibility of the Bible from the fact of its own existence, limiting our consideration, however, to the New Testament, and especially the Gospels. We quoted from Bishop McIlvaine to show how contemporaneous history attests the truth of the Gospels. And at the time the Bishop wrote his valuable treatise, say fifty or sixty years ago, we were, in a sense, limited in that kind of testimony to the period of the Gospels. But during the latter half of the nineteenth century, and beginning, indeed, a little earlier, archaeological research in Bible lands has enabled us to bring forth much of the same kind of testimony for the Old Testament.

It is almost redundant to present it in the light of what may be said to have been fairly established in the last chapter, but nevertheless, its fascinating nature, and overwhelming, corroborative force, furnish an independent reason for its treatment.

These archaeological discoveries, the fruit of the pick-axe and the spade, include such things as inscriptions on rocks or temple walls, statues, obelisks, pavement slabs, clay tablets, papyrus rolls, coins, seals, pottery, and other objects, dug up out of the old buried cities of the past, and now

preserved in the great museums of London, Paris, Constantinople, Berlin, New York, and other cities of the world.

The history of these discoveries really begins with Egypt. At the commencement of the last century, a French engineer, excavating near Rosetta, at the mouth of the Nile, found a stone of black granite, about 3 feet, 9 inches high, 2 feet 4½ inches wide, and 11 inches thick, containing strange characters engraved upon it, corresponding to those upon the obelisks and temples of that land. But below these characters were several lines of another kind of writing, and below this again, several lines in Greek. The last-named language could easily be read, but the other writings remained a riddle, until in 1818, the French Champollion, by comparing the known tongue with the unknown ones, discovered the combination, and thus unlocked the door that led to the unfolding of a history of a people who antedated Israel perhaps three thousand years.

The reading of the Rosetta stone meant the reading of all the other hieroglyphic records of Egyptian pyramids, sphinxes, temples, and buried ruins of every kind, and the establishment, in consequence, of the accuracy of the records and hints concerning ancient Egypt found in the Old Testament.

The next step in the history of these discoveries takes us to Western Asia and the Mesopotamian Valley of the Tigris and Euphrates. As early as

1810-20, little clay bricks, with wedge-shaped characters, began to be found in this neighborhood. But in 1842, P. E. Botts, the French consul at Mosul on the upper Tigris, a trained archaeologist, began digging at Khorsabad, and ultimately revealed the palace of the great Sargon (722-705 B. C.), probably the most magnificent palace the world ever saw, covering an area of more than 25 acres.

Three years later, A. H. Layard, a young Englishman, with the aid of funds contributed by a wealthy nobleman, began to lay bare the city of Nineveh, which had been hidden underneath the mounds for nearly two thousand years; and in the course of his excavation came upon the palace of Sennacherib, the king of Assyria, a contemporary of Hezekiah, (705-681 B. C.). In 1872, George Smith, an officer in the British museum, digging further into the mounds of Nineveh, unearthed a library of thirty thousand tablets and cylinders, belonging to the collection of Assur-banipal (668-625 B. C.), a contemporary of Manasseh and Josiah. The position occupied by these tablets showed an arrangement of topics, somewhat as we arrange books on the shelves of our libraries.

All the letters on these brick tablets, and other things, discovered in this Asiatic valley, were wedge-shaped or cuneiform, and remained unsolved until 1835, when Henry C. Rawlinson, an English officer in the Persian army discovered the solution much after the manner of the Rosetta stone—one

of the greatest triumphs for philology ever made. To quote Professor Price, this gives us at one stroke "a whole valley-full of thrifty cities, well-organized governments, conquering armies, and world-wide rulers."

In this connection it is appropriate to say that in 1887, there were found at Tel el-Amarna in Egypt, three hundred clay tablets in this coneiform language, proving to be international letters and despatches from these Asiatic nations to their great Southern neighbor, written principally about 1500 B. C., while Israel was still dwelling with the Pharaohs. The bearing of some of these letters and despatches on the history of the Old Testament will appear later.

We now reach the exploration in the Holy Land itself, undertaken by an English society organized for that purpose, which began operations at Jerusalem in 1867. A survey of Western Palestine was made in 1872; of Eastern Palestine some ten years later; of Northern Palestine still later. The results of these explorations have appeared in quarterly publications issued by the society before mentioned.

Passing from the history of these discoveries, let us consider some of their results, taking them in the order in which the subject or events are recorded in the Bible:—

First, as to the antediluvian period, it is found that almost all the great nations of antiquity preserved legends of the creation, the fall of man, and

the deluge. They vary in importance, but some are such close resemblances to the record in Genesis as to suggest, either that they copied from Genesis, or vice versa, or that both records are due to a common inheritance from a single, and that necessarily, a divine source. The conviction increases that the last-named is the most plausible solution of the question. But of all of these traditions, the record in Genesis is the purest, the most dignified, and altogether the nearest to what any mature mind must conceive to have been their original form.

Of all these heathen legends of creation and antediluvian events, those in the cuneiform language of Babylon and Assyria, are the most interesting and valuable. They are found in what are called the "Creation Tablets," supposed originally to have numbered seven, and containing six points of similarity with Genesis, the unlikeness consisting only in two particulars, namely, the personification of chaos as an evil warrior, and the mention of various gods, or polytheism, in the work of creation.

These tablets further recognize a rest day, not so much for man however, as for the gods, who were to cease their anger on this day. This day seems, moreover, to have returned in cycles of seven, as with us. "The inscriptions further tell of a primitive, sacred garden, in which there was a tree of life, approach to which was limited to the gods or distinguished persons. The fall of man is implied in a remarkable representation on a cy-

linder, in the center of which stands a tree from which fruit depends; on one side stands a man, on the other a woman, while behind the latter is the crooked, crawling form of a serpent. No words accompany it, the picture being left to tell its own story."

The Babylonian account of the deluge is especially complete as found on the eleventh tablet of a great epic, which with others, was discovered by George Smith. The account speaks of the building of a ship, and the preservation of a seed of life; a deluge of waters with a great storm; the landing upon a mountain; the sending forth of birds; the offering of sacrifice on landing, and the acceptance of a sweet savor by the gods.

This subject is so interesting and important that we shall continue its consideration in a second chapter.

CHAPTER III.

MORE BURIED PROOFS.

IN THE last chapter we traced some of the results of the recent archaeological discoveries through the antediluvian period, touching upon creation, the fall, and the deluge, and in this chapter we reach the Patriarchal period which begins with the genealogical table in the 10th of Genesis. This, however, is rather ethnographical than genealogical, showing the origin of the nations and their locations in the different parts of the earth. It teaches the original unity of the race in location and language, and a subsequent separation along three lines of departure, namely: Ham, Japheth, and Shem. This separation was in language, as well as geographical direction. There has been no chapter of Genesis more spoken against than this, but the research under consideration is demonstrating it to be historical in every particular.

The names of this chapter are, with few exceptions, those of races rather than individuals. One of these exceptions, however, is Nimrod, the founder of the first world-monarchy, that of Babylon and Assyria. Nimrod, as there described, is of Ethiopian origin, which had been denied by the critics, until within about 50 years, when Sir Henry Rawlinson, already named, proved conclusively

from the cuneiform inscriptions that the Biblical statement was correct.

The tower of Babel has been identified. Its ruins existed in Nebuchadnezzar's day, who informs us by an inscription on a cylinder that the gods incited him to restore it, and that in doing so, he did not injure its site or change its foundation walls. The ruins of this work of Nebuchadnezzar, built on the original pile, are in evidence today, and constitute a remarkable feature of the landscape in the vicinity of ancient Babylon.

The story of Abraham has been referred to in a recent publication with some pretence to learning, as no more to be believed than "the story of Achilles, or Aeneas, or King Arthur," but, as a matter of fact, documents, written in the time of Abraham and in the land in which he was reared, are now brought to the light of day. His birthplace has been discovered, the details of his sojourn in Egypt are now known to bear every evidence of historicity, and we have similar confirmatory proof concerning his famous battle with the confederate kings, mentioned in Genesis 14. Even Melchizedek, whom he met, is not the mystery he was, as is proven from the Tel el-Amarna tablets, referred to in the previous chapter.

The Patriarchal period concludes with the history of Joseph, upon whose times also much light has now been thrown. We know something concerning the "king that knew not Joseph," and the story of Israel's oppression in Egypt from sources

other than the Bible. It has been discovered that Rameses II was the Pharaoh of this period, whose mummied face today looks out upon us from countless photographs. His storehouses or treasure cities have been found, in whose walls the handiwork of the Hebrew slaves can be seen and handled, even the bricks that were made "without straw!"

Passing from the Patriarchal to the Mosaic period, it is now generally admitted that Menepteh II, whose mummy has also been discovered, was the Pharaoh of the exodus. The exodus itself is not recorded on any Egyptian monument for self-evident reasons, but the features and geography of the route bear remarkable testimony to the historical reality of the Bible record.

Recent explorations have made clear several important matters concerning the journeying in the wilderness. For example, the point of crossing at the Red Sea; the real character of the desert; the location of the giving of the law; of Kadesh-barnea, and other important places. Great light has been thrown upon the history and character of several of the peoples who inhabited the land of Canaan, notably the Hittites and Amorites, revealing the reasons of God's anger against them for their gross iniquity, and showing the necessity for supernatural intervention if the Israelites were to triumph over them.

Indeed the explorations keep tally with the later history of Israel from this time afterward, through

the period of Joshua, the rise of the monarchy, the glories of the reigns of David and Solomon, the division of the kingdom, the captivity and the restoration.

Particular attention should be called to the discovery of the Moabite stone, which has become as famous as the Rosetta stone, already spoken of—indeed, no other monument of antiquity has been the subject of such literature as this. In second Kings 3:4-5, a man named Mesha is spoken of as king of Moab, for the first and only time. Hs is called a "sheepmaster" who rendered unto Israel a large number of lambs and rams with their wool, as the tribute of a vassal to his master. The story then goes on to say that "When Ahab was dead, the king of Moab rebelled against the king of Israel."

Critics have demanded corroboration of all this, asking whether such a man reigned over Moab at this time, and whether Ahab was reigning contemporaneously in Israel, and whether Moab was noted for sheep raising, and whether she was subject to Israel and paid such tribute, and whether she was successful afterwards in breaking her yoke of bondage? Contemporaneous history has been silent on these matters for all these centuries until August 19, 1868, when Mr. F. A. Klein, of the Church Missionary Society, found the "Moabite stone," so-called, on the site of ancient Dibon.

It is of black basalt, 3 feet, 10 inches high, 2 feet broad, and 1 foot, 2½ inches thick, rounded at the

top and bottom to nearly the shape of a semi-circle. It contains an inscription on one side, consisting of 34 lines, naming Mesha as the king of Moab, and identifying it as a monument of gratitude to his god for delivering him from the hands of Israel. It speaks of Omri and his son Ahab; of their oppression of the Moabites; of the ultimate victory over Israel; and mentions even the shepherds and the sheep.

While Mr. Klein was negotiating for this stone, the French consul at Jerusalem offered to purchase it from the natives at a large price, which led the Turkish authorities to interfere in the matter so that the native Bedouins, rather than give it up to them, broke it into pieces. Fortunately, the French consul had taken a successful impression of it while it was entire, and afterwards two-thirds of it was recovered and put together again. It is now in the Louvre at Paris, and a plaster cast of it is deposited in the British museum.

Quoting Professor Price, "Our Old Testament has now become a marvelously new Old Testament. Many of its transformers were peoples whose ambitions were co-equal with the abode of men, whose policy was 'might makes right,' and whose interests were supremely selfish. But their records, chiseled in adamantine volumes, stamped in imperishable clay, painted in the darkness of the tombs, or cut on the mountain side, bring in impartial, unimpeachable and conclusive proofs of the veracity of the Old Testament."

Professor Price, thus referred to, has prepared a most interesting volume, entitled "Monuments and the Old Testament," popular in style, yet scholarly and accurate as far as it goes, which I would recommend to those who would like to read up upon this subject further. A similar volume is "Modern Discoveries and the Bible," by Rev. John Urquhart, Hilprecht's, "Explorations in Bible Lands" is larger and more scholarly, but perhaps not so well adapted for the class of readers now in mind. "The Origin of Nations," by George Rawlinson, M. A., is an invaluable work, covering the subjects referred to in Genesis 10. To all of these, and others, the writer acknowledges his indebtedness in the preparation of this and the preceding chapter.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CONTENTS OF THE BIBLE A PROOF OF ITS CREDIBILITY.

WE have considered some of the contemporary evidence of the credibility of the Bible both in the case of the New Testament and the Old, and in this chapter will dwell upon the testimony which the contents of the Bible itself have to bear to the same fact.

As we peruse its contents, we find the Bible to be, not only a good book, but a wonderful book —so good that bad men could not have produced it, and so wonderful that good men, unaided by God, could not have produced it. As creation cannot be accounted for without a divine Creator, so the Bible, taken by itself, cannot be accounted for without a divine Author.

In proof of this, consider first, the structure of the Bible, in which respect it is unparalleled in the world's literature. It consists of 66 books, written by 40 different authors, living in various parts of the world, and scattered over a period of 16 centuries. And yet notwithstanding this, the book taken as a whole, is perfectly uniform in its plan and teaching. There is only one center and one circumference to its prophecy, which is the person and kingdom of the mediator, Jesus Christ.

Its symbolism throughout is one as to form, color and number.

There is not a single inconsistency, real contradiction or adulteration in the entire scope and range of its teachings from Genesis to Revelation. All its parts are necessary to the whole, all are necessary to complete each other, and all, to quote another, "are pervaded by one life principle."

Moreover, strange to say, while the human authors of the different books were varied in their capacity and characteristics, yet none of them, with perhaps the exceptions of Moses, Solomon, Daniel and Paul, were known to be distinguished for philosophic attainments. They were warriors, priests, shepherds, farmers, and fishermen. The more one dwells upon these facts, the more is he impressed with their super-natural character, and the more is he led to see that one mind, and only a divine mind, must have been behind all these writers in all these centuries; and that the plan and the operation must have been his alone.

Consider in the second place, not only the structure, but the knowledge of the Bible. And just here what is referred to is its scientific knowledge. Not that it professes to teach science,; it was revealed indeed for a very different purpose, and yet its teachings are always in harmony with science. We have already seen this to be true in its archaeological references, but the same thing is true with reference to the geology and astronomy of the Bible. In all these spheres of investigation

and many more, the Bible is seen to have been in advance of the greatest discoveries of modern times; proving that the writers, who could not have known these things on the natural plane, must have been directed by a divine mind.

Much is said at times about a conflict between science and the Bible, but the only real conflict is between wrong inductions of science and wrong interpretations of the Bible. Really apprehend the truth in both cases, and science and the Bible have ever agreed.

In the third place, consider the teachings of the Bible as distinct from its knowledge. The teachings in mind are those on moral and religious themes, where its originality and superiority must be manifest to all who will give the necessary attention to a comparison. And this comparison need not to be made with the more inferior religions of the world, but with those of the most refined and cultivated nations. More of this will be spoken of in subsequent chapters, but just now it may be enough to say that the teachings of the Bible in the face of any and all the other religions of the world, do in themselves prove their credibility.

Take finally, the adaptation of these teachings to human needs, the deepest needs of the human heart. To quote the author of "The Gordian Knot":— "Natural philosophers are fond of discoursing on the co-relation of force and energy. The mutual adaptation of the eye to light, for example, proves

that each was made and meant for the other; and so there is a mutual moral adaptation of man to the Bible, and Bible to man."

This adaptation reaches the most urgent yearnings of the soul. It is seen not only in meeting every spiritual need, but every spiritual need of every class of men. As Dr. Barrows says, "It speaks to the child heart which comes back to earth with each new generation, and yet keeps ahead of the most disciplined mind at the same time." The greatest scholars cannot exhaust it, and yet it can be taught to a primary class in the Sunday School. And this adaptation, moreover, is seen in meeting every spiritual need of every class in every age—the twentieth century, as well as the first, New York or Boston, as well as Jerusalem or Athens. Such a book can only be a transcript of the divine mind, a revelation of the divine purpose. This argument, indeed, may be said to prove the inspiration of the Bible, and hence to be somewhat in anticipation of what is to be presented in these "Primers" further on; but nevertheless, its credibility is included in its inspiration, and so far the argument is in place here.

CHAPTER V.

JUDAISM AND OTHER ANCIENT RELIGIONS.

AFTER considering the contents of the Bible as a proof of its credibility, it might be well to accentuate that proof by comparing these contents with those of the bibles of other religions. Not that all the other religions have bibles of the character of ours, but they have books of one kind or another which set forth the ideas they represent.

Up until very recently this study of Comparative Religion has been limited to those religions which come in contact more particularly with Christianity, some of which will be considered later on. But the archaeological discoveries, already alluded to, have put us in possession of data concerning the ancient religions with which Judaism came in touch, suggesting what we trust may prove an interesting and helpful chapter or two in the comparison between them and the religion of the Old Testament.

These ancient religions have been divided into

three classes, the Semitic, Egyptian, and Persian. By the first-named is meant those of the nations more immediately related to Judah or Israel in origin and speech, like the Canaanites, the Phoenicians, the Philistines, Moabites, Syrians, Assyrians, and Babylonians. None of these nations, indeed, except the Assyrian, has left religious records or literature from which a theological system might be educed, but there are other sources which either furnish many interesting facts or give rise to probable conjectures.

For example, it is clear that all these religions were of the polytheistic order. That is, they paid respect to a variety of objects, sometimes real and sometimes imaginary, supposed to be possessed of the will and power to help or hinder human designs. Some of these objects were the sun, the moon, the earth, a mountain, or a tree; and some of them were called "fetiches," i. e., detached pieces of matter to which this power was attributed.

In course of time the idea that these objects were themselves agents of power was done away with, and they were supposed to be only under the direction of agents of another sort. The respect paid to the images of gods therefore, were ordinarily symbolical. These images were not themselves the gods, for example, but only represented them, and the intellectuality of the individual worshipper determined how far the image was to be disassociated from the god it represented.

To pure monotheism, however, or the doctrine

that there is only one God, none of these Semitic religions ever atttained, except in the case of Israel, thus proving very clearly the divine original, i. e., the credibility of the religion for which it stood.

And yet, while this is true, it should be stated right here and before we advance further, that there is reason to believe that all these religions, and for that matter all the polytheistic religions of the world, point back to a time when there was a universal belief in but one God. The present aspect of polytheism, therefore, is at once an evidence both of its decline from the truth through sin, and the fact that the religion of the Bible is the truth.

In regard to the duty of the worshipper toward the god in these ancient religions, the governing idea was that the god required to be propitiated. He wanted just the things that man wanted, such as food and drink, which were to be supplied in the form of sacrifices and libations. Residences and shelters must be provided for these gods at times. Incense must be burned for them to smell. Their good-will must be sought by demonstrations of affections. They must be flattered, and entertainments must be gotten up for their amusement. It was thought also that they must be propitiated, not only by the gifts and honors of the worshippers, but by their pains and privations. Compare here such Scripture passages as Ezekiel 8:14 and 1 Kings 18:28. No one can compare these things with the teachings of the Old Testament without perceiving the infinite superiority of Judaism over

such religions, and hence its divinity or credibility.

Of course, there must be a priesthood connected with these religions. These officials were sometimes called by a word meaning "augur" or "soothsayer," suggesting something corresponding to what we know as prophesying. And indeed, among all the primitive peoples, the aid of the gods was not only desired in actionfi but in guidance, their will was sought, and the future was attempted to be penetrated by their assistance. This assistance at times was afforded by means of dreams, in which the god would appear to the worshipper or convey a message to him. The interpretation of this "message" belonged altogether to the priestly caste, and was attended with great mystery, being conveyed to the worshipper in a kind of rhyming prose, like the cooing of a dove, and suggesting what is written in Isaiah 8:19, or the reported doings of spiritualistic seances in our own times.

And yet, although the worshippers of these religions sought to penetrate the future, they seem to have known nothing of a future life. The grave was an eternal resting-place to them, and immortality was simply the leaving of offspring. Childlessness therefore was a grievous curse. The idea of a glorious resurrection was never dreamed of.

These considerations, therefore, go to prove the necessity of a revelation from God, such as the Bible only affords, if the race was ever to possess the truth concerning God, or its duties in relation to God. Nor can man say, as some have attempt-

ed to say, that all religions are only the result of the evolution of human thought, and that the religion of the Bible is simply the highest and the best thought that man has himself conceived. To say nothing further of these religions showing evidence of a descent from what they once were, it is clear that the gulf between them and that of Israel or Judah is too wide and too deep, to admit of such an hypothesis.

Especially is this true when we reflect that the latter, that is, the religion of the Old Testament, is not something following after the others, but existing side by side with them. How does it come about that all the national relatives of Israel were thus puerile and debased in their religious conceptions, polytheistic in their ideas of God, while she alone was so exalted, so refined, and altogether and always monotheistic?

But one consistent explanation of this phenomenon can be given, namely, that the true God revealed himself to that particular family when all the families of the earth had forgotten and turned away from him, and that the form in which he thus revealed himself to them has come down to us in the Holy Scriptures.

CHAPTER VI.

THE MUMMY AND THE TOWER OF SILENCE.

WHAT was said in the last chapter of the Semitic religions in comparison with that of the Old Testament, might be repeated in language scarcely different of the Egyptian and the Persian religions.

One thing differentiating the Egyptians from all other ancient people, however, was their great concern for the state of man after death. Not that they understood the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, but only thought of the future state of man as one in which his material condition was not essentially different from that of the present time. The Egyptian mummy, for example, is historic. It was made by removing from the bodies those internal organs whose preservation was especially difficult, introducing aromatic drugs within and saturating the whole with a chemical mixture. The body was then swathed with linen, daubed with gum, and in the case of the wealthy, deposited in a coffin. Under these conditions it might remain intact for 5,000 years. The desire and reason underlying this preservation were the belief that after death the body still retained sensation.

This explains the building of the pyramids as tombs, for the house in which such a body was deposited must possess the element of permanence.

Provision must be made for the wants of the dead similar to those of the living, and although the dead lacked the instruments for the enjoyment of such things, yet the inconsistency did not affect the practice. An operation was performed with adze and chisel to open his eyes and mouth to enable him to enjoy them. Sometimes even this was not performed upon the corpse itself, but upon an image representing it. Teeth were provided in this way, and an attempt was made to introduce material food.

Of course, in process of time, difficult questions would arise in the minds of the people about these thing, to which the priestly philosophers would reply that it was not the body after all that enjoyed the food, but a kind of invisible "double" of the body, called by the name of "Ka," to which representations of the food might be presented, instead of the food itself. Some philosophers went so far as to say that this "Ka" might be fed with prayers instead of material food. Bye and bye this doctrine of a "Ka" led to the idea that the dead migrated to another place, an Elysium in the sky. But still the emblaming process and all its accompanying ceremonies were continued, for as another says, "whole professions do not allow themselves to be abolished by logic." The priests still insisted in other words that these things were necessary to secure the happiness of the dead in the Elysium referred to.

But another feature differentiating the Egyptian

worship from the Semitic was that the tenant of Egyptian shrines was not an inanimate idol, but a living animal—a bull, a lion, a ram, a crocodile, cat, swallow, snake, or one of a variety of other creatures. Sometimes where an individual animal was worshipped it was regarded as an incarnation of a god, and sometimes where a species was worshipped it was regarded simply as the favorite of some god.

Yet the leading god of Egypt was called Osiris, said to mean the Nile, but who, or what, he was originally, no one knows. Was he the first man, or was he an ideal man? Sometimes he was identified with the Nile, sometimes with the sun. Indeed, as all writers on the subject are forced to admit, the history of Egyptian gods is so complicated and confused, because of the long history of that people, in which speculation was added to speculation, and theory to theory, and inconsistency to inconsistency, that it is impossible to say just what they believed or just what they taught.

And still they had a priesthood whose profession it was to maintain these speculations not only, but who formed a large and important part of the population. They were the learned class. They alone possessed the secret of writing. To them judicial functions were entrusted. They possessed almost supreme powers in the state. Joseph, the second to Pharaoh, was married to the daughter of such a priest.

All these things show us that the same remarks

apply to Egypt as to the Semitic faiths; except that the Egyptians being so much older and so much more cultivated as a people, the comparison in their case carries all the stronger testimony. Does not such a comparison prove the need of the Old Testament revelation, and prove it to be true?

The Persian religion suggests that of the Jews in one particular, viz: that it was claimed to be based on a revelation. Their chief god had communicated it to a prophet named Zoroaster, who may have been a myth, but who they insisted lived about the time of Moses. They had five sacred books containing laws, stories, prayers, hymns, spells, and medical prescriptions. They believed in two gods or two powers rather, good and evil; the one creating all that ministers to man's comfort, the other all that contributes to his woe, with a ceaseless struggle between them.

To pass abruptly to some of their practices, their treatment of the dead is as peculiar as that of the Egyptians, although its spirit and method are precisely opposite. The Egyptians preserved and dignified the corpse, but the Persian removed it as far as possible from all contaminating relations to the earth. The idea of the Egyptian found expression in the "mummy," that of the Persian in the "tower of silence." This was an elevated pedestal or platform far away from human dwellings, on which the corpse was raised and to which it was firmly affixed, in the expectation of its destruction by the wild beasts or birds. To bury or burn it, they regarded

as inventions of the evil god. They feared to offend the earth or the water by causing either to be tainted with the dead, not, however, as a sanitary, but as a religious principle.

Fire-worship was, and is, a further peculiarity of this religion. Just why it should be worshipped more than any other natural element is not absolutely clear. Lightning, however, was supposed to be the son of the sky, and so fire was afterwards called the son of the chief god. Fire also was the messenger between earth and heaven because the sacrificial flame carried man's gift from earth to heaven. There was the notion, too, that the fire represented the family's center or point of re-union for the living and the dead, and finally, it was connected with clearness and purity.

This idea of family re-union suggests that Ancestral worship was another peculiarity of this religion. They thought it necessary to maintain the souls of relatives, for which reason sacred feasts were held, with consecration of cakes on monthly and annual commemorations of their deaths. On these occasions the dead brought with them 10,000 spirits save one, who, if the feast were prepared, blessed the house; if it were neglected, complained of it to the supreme power with opposite results. The dead required clothing which was sometimes placed on the sacred cakes, the priests doubtless having means to dispose of it "without seriously shocking the credulity of the worshipper."

Space will not permit the further pursuit of this

subject; but those who desire to look into it further will be much aided by a little book entitled, "Religions of Bible Lands," by Prof. D. S. Margoliouth, (New York, Armstrong Sons), which has been used in the preparation of this and the preceding chapter. May we not in conclusion say, however, that Jehovah is the true God, and the Bible the only revelation?

CHAPTER VII.

CHRISTIANITY AND BUDDHISM.

THIS chapter and the following may be considered as a continuation of the thought in the two preceding ones. Under the head of "Judaism and Other Ancient Religions," and "The Mummy and The Tower of Silence," we entered upon a branch of our subject sometimes called "Comparative Religion," and we propose to pursue it a little further. We must already have been convinced of its value in demonstrating the truth or credibility of the Bible even though the comparison has been limited to those religions only coming into contact with that of the Old Testament.

Let us now look at one or two which modern missions have brought into vital contact with Christianity stirring them into opposition to its claims.

This chapter will be devoted to Buddhism, so-named after its founder, "Buddha" or "the Enlightened one," whose birth name, however, was Guatama. He was born in India about 624 B. C., and was the son of a king of that country. Little is known of his early history save that he was married, and at about the age of 29 he gave up domestic life for that of a hermit, during which period he is said to have "miraculously" attained to supreme wisdom and knowledge. He seems to have

been an earnest and good man whose precepts and principles of life rise to the highest level of any outside of the Bible. But alas! his only cure for the ills of life which he sought to avoid by his asceticism, is "Nirvana," which means practically, the extinction of life, at least the extinction of the individual's being.

Buddhism, like Confucianism, and indeed like Zoroastrianism, to which a little attention has been given previously, is, after all, only a reformation of an earlier faith. The earlier faith of which Buddhism is a reformation is known as Brahmanism. But what is Brahmanism? As one of its students and critics has said, it is the best illustration extant of the philosophy of pantheism. And what is pantheism? It is the theory that everything is God, or parts or modifications of God. There is just one absolute substance, according to pantheism, and all material objects and interests, and even moral distinctions, such as good and evil do not exist, but are illusions. Nothing really exists, according to pantheism, unless existence is predicated of the one absolute substance referred to. Now Brahmanism says this one absolute substance is Brahma. Brahma is without intelligence, or freedom, or holiness, or love. Brahma is not a person but an abstraction. From Brahma come gods, men, earth, sky, and all material things, or rather the "illusion" of these things, which we seem to possess.

Now this coming forth from Brahma is in the

nature of an opposition to Brahma. It ought not to be, and is in that sense evil. Hence the soul of man is evil, and can find no peace till it returns again to Brahma or, in other words, loses its consciousness, becomes extinct, a result brought about through the process known as the transmigration of souls.

It will be at once seen, even by a cursory examination of the subject, that there are monstrous contradictions in Brahmanism. It is clearly untrue to its own fundamental principles. Those principles should have prevented its deifying any material object simply for the reason that it denied the existence of any. It should have said: "Whatever is, is wrong, because nothing can be." But it said just the opposite to this, viz: "Whatever is, is right," deifying everything instead of nothing. It is just here that Buddhism comes into view, and finds its justification, so to speak, in an attempt to rectify this contradiction, to reform Brahmanism, in which indeed it was successful, but to a limited degree.

Buddhism became in time the state religion of India, and penetrated into Asia and China. In the latter country indeed, it claims equal prominence with Confucianism itself, the native religion of the land. It is even being imported into these Western climes, and finds its expression in theosophy, spiritism, Christian Science, and kindred cults. It claims today the allegiance of one-third of the population of the globe, and doubtless will be among

the most influential agents of the anti-Christ in that approaching crisis of the world's history when the Son of Man shall destroy him with the brightness of his coming. Buddhism has created an abundant literature and a vast civilization, notwithstanding that it is the saddest wail of humanity in its longing for a redemption of which it is in total ignorance.

The latest form of Buddhism is called Hinduism, and the best thing we can do in the close of this chapter to show its inferiority to the religion of the Bible, and to convince of the credibility of the latter, is to compare the two in certain great fundamentals.

For example, Hinduism does indeed seem to hold to the unity of the Godhead, for it affirms that "Brahma is one and there is no second;" but it does not mean that there is no second Brahma only, but no second existence whatsoever. Therefore, the god of Hinduism can not be a personal being because he is distinct from nothing. "We are all parts of that one," Hinduism says.

In the same way, Hinduism knows no sin. There can be no sin where there is no personal being to sin against. Moreover, with the Hindu, all that man is or does is the result of a previous state of existence, (the transmigration idea), of which previous state of existence he has no recollection, and for which he has no accountability. There can be no sin in such a case. The Hindu may sometimes speak of sin, but he means "desire," i. e., the

desire for anything whether it be what we call good or evil. Desire for happiness, desire for Heaven is sin in the religion of Hinduism. "It is as much a sin to desire perfume for the body as to kill a man, to sing a hymn as to tell a lie." The disciple of Brahma should desire nothing because there is nothing outside of Brahma.

The Hindu may speak of salvation, but he does not mean deliverance from guilt or punishment, but simply escape from the various ills of embodied life. These ills are inseparable from personal existence, hence, in the last analysis, salvation is deliverance from personal consciousness altogether and absorption into Brahma—extinction of being, "Nirvana." All souls shall exist eternally, according to Hinduism, but they will not exist individually. After many transmigrations in different forms, in different heavens and in different hells, they will thus be absorbed, they will thus pass into Nirvana.

It is but just to say that there are many good features in Hindu ethics, of which may be mentioned the enforcement of the duty of children to their parents, evenness of temper, truthfulness, the sacredness of marriage, and some other things, but these are only in theory. Practically considered, the Hindu language has no such word as "chaste" which can be applied to the male sex. Obscenity is not only common among both sexes but is really fostered by their religion which, in certain aspects, is grossly licentious. Their caste system again, with which we are all more or less familiar, is fun-

damentally opposed to the second table of the divine law.

Buddhism, so far as it may be distinguished from Hinduism, is said to be an improvement upon it so far as ethics or morals are concerned, protesting against caste and asserting human equality. But since, like the latter, it ignores the Being of God there are no duties which man owes to him, and hence there is no basis on which to force man's duty to his fellowman. The highest motive for right-doing in a Christian is obedience and love toward God, the highest motive in a Buddhist or a Hindu is the selfish one of escaping conscious existence.

These few scattered thoughts about this religion, very imperfectly put together, may nevertheless help in confirmation of our faith by the very contrast.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRISTIANITY AND MOHAMMEDANISM.

THE second of the great religions of the time in actual contact and conflict with Christianity, with which the latter has only to be compared to show its infinite superiority, and hence to prove its credibility, is Mohammedanism. This religion is just about 1200 years more modern than Buddhism referred to in the previous chapter. Buddhism began with Buddha 624 B. C., and Mohammedanism began with Mohammed, who was born about 570 A. D. Mecca, in Arabia, was his birthplace, and he is said to have been the only child of a poor widow belonging to a heathen family, but claiming descent from Ishmael.

The early years of Mohammed were spent in obscurity. It is said he was subject to epileptic fits as a child, and this has been supposed to have some bearing on those "visions" which he afterwards claimed to have seen, though of this one can hardly speak with positiveness. At the age of 25 he married a rich widow of 40, the care of whose caravans on commercial journeys brought him into contact with Jews and Christians, from whom, although unable to read, he acquired a hearsay knowledge of the Bible history and tradition.

Fifteen years subsequent to his marriage, or when he was a man of forty, he claimed to have

received a call from Gabriel to his so-called holy office of prophet and deliverer. This was the first of many similar "revelations" he professed to have received during the next twenty years, all of which are recorded in the Koran which is the Mohammedan Bible.

The public career of Mohammed dates then, from this "call," during the first three years of which he secured only about forty converts. He was visited with persecutions some time later, and on July 15, 1622, he fled to Medina, which flight is known historically as the "Hegira," and marks the commencement of what has come to be called the Mohammedan era. It was now that Mohammed was recognized as a "prophet." It was now that he raised an army, and began those terrific and successful encounters with his Jewish and Christian enemies enabling him, at length, to enter Mecca in triumph, and become master of all Arabia. He died at the period of his ninth climacteric, 63.

The students of Mohammedanism attribute its very rapid spread in the East to five things: First, its spirit of fanaticism; second, its use of the sword; third, the weakness of the Roman Empire in the East at that time; fourth, the rivalry between the Greek and Latin branches of the church; fifth, the sensual promises it held out for its votaries both in this life and the next. Every reader of history knows that its conquests in the West were stayed by the victory of Charles Martel, at Tours, in 732,

and also that about 300 years later, the Turks overcame the Arabians, adopting their religion.

Mohammedanism still remains, therefore, the religion of Turkey and Arabia, and has also spread into other large portions of the East and the southeast, and will doubtless be here to be reckoned with, and to receive its reckoning, as in the case of Buddhism, in that day when he shall come "Who will come and will not tarry."

Let us now compare briefly, the doctrine and practice of Mohammedanism with that of Christianity, for whatever of weight the comparison may afford in attesting the divinity and hence the truth of the Bible. We are following here, in a general way, the late Professor Kellogg's treatment of the theme in his "Hand-book of Comparative Religion," an excellent little volume for every reader to possess, published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication.

First of all, as to the nature of God, Mohammedanism agrees with the Bible in affirming his Unity, but disagrees with it in opposing his trinity in unity. It claims to have a mission to destroy idolatry, but the idolatry it has in mind is not so much that of polytheism as represented by the Pagan religions, but that which it sees expressed in the Trinity as represented by the Christian religion. It is but just to say, however, that its opposition to this doctrine is as it sees it manifested in that paganized form of Christianity known as the papacy, for which it seems to have been raised

up as a scourge of God at the beginning of the dark ages. Nevertheless, in its relation to true Christianity, it is what Dr. Schaff calls, "the great Unitarian heresy of the East." Mohammedanism accepts the Personality of God as well as his Unity, only that it represents him as a Person who uses his will without reference to moral reasons or principles of righteousness. If he shows mercy, it is not from any necessity of his nature, but simply from caprice. If he exercises punishment, it is not on the incorrigible as such, but as an arbitrary act of his will. If he is holy, it simply means that he is majestic or glorious, not necessarily pure or separate from sin. The Mohammedan god has 99 names, but "Father" does not appear among them.

In the same way Mohammedanism may be said to be a caricature or present a counterfeit of the Christian doctrine of sin. It recognizes sin as opposition to God's will, but limits it to wilful violations of his law, excluding sins of ignorance, and utterly denying the great underlying fact of the sinful nature of man. Then, too, it makes God responsible for sin in two ways; first, by teaching that his will is arbitrary and not based on abstract righteousness; and second, by teaching that the free acts of man, whether good or bad, are all foreordained in the same way. The first idea gives man liberty to say that God commands gross crimes, and hence to commit them in his name. The second, makes man a puppet in God's hands and altogether irresponsible.

To pass now from the Mohammedan idea of sin to that of salvation, it regards the latter as consisting entirely in deliverance from punishment. Of course, therefore, no expiatory sacrifice is required, and no necessity exists for the incarnation of the Son of God. Jesus, in the view of Mohammedans, was only a man, a prophet like Mohammed, but inferior to him. Faith, with them, is not trust in a reconciled Father through an atoning Savior, but merely an intellectual assent, a verbal assent, indeed, to the dogma that, "there is no God but one, and Mohammed is his prophet." Good works consist of five times of daily prayer, almsgiving, fasting, and at least one pilgrimage to Mecca. Finally, Mohammedanism teaches that salvation is only to be found in that faith.

It is when we come to the teachings of Mohammedanism about the future life that the grossness of its conception strikes us with the greatest force. In one way, it may be said to draw much from the Bible and have much in agreement with it, as witness its belief in the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and the intermediate state between death and the resurrection. But mark the contrasts when details are reached! Treating of the intermediate state and the condition of disembodied spirits, Mohammedanism holds that the souls of its prophets are admitted into Paradise at once, that the souls of its martyrs rest in the crops of green birds in that place, and that all other souls linger around the graves where their bodies are

buried. In the resurrection, faithful Mohammedans are raised in their own fleshly bodies in various degrees of honor according to merit, but unbelievers (i. e., in Mohammedanism), will be raised probably in the form of apes or swine; or, if they should be raised in their own bodies, then the latter will be variously distorted. The resurrection of the faithful, as has been said, will be in bodies of flesh like unto their present bodies, whose pleasures in Paradise will be animal, of course, and gross and sensual in the extreme. The pains of hell for the unfaithful and unbelieving are dwelt upon at great length, showing no trace of pity. It is said that they will be broiled in hell-fire, that scalding water and corruption will flow from their bodies, and that they will have filthy and boiling water to drink. But we forbear.

As might be supposed, the ethics or morals of this faith are quite in keeping with these doctrinal positions. Here again, however, there is much in common with the Bible making the contrasts all the more conspicuous. For example, murder is commanded in the case of unbelievers, and particularly so in the case of apostates from the faith. Slavery is not only tolerated, but that, too, in the case of women and children taken in battle, is commanded. Theft, indeed, is prohibited, but the penalty for it is the excision of both hands! Polygamy is authorized, and husbands may not only divorce their wives at pleasure, but beat and confine them at their will when judged perverse. In a word, Dr.

Cyrus Hamlin, for many years a prominent missionary in Turkey, summarizes the whole system on its ethical side, as one of "slavery, polygamy, and death."

CHAPTER IX.

CHRISTIANITY AND ALL OTHER RELIGIONS.

WHEN we entered upon the consideration of Christianity, as compared with other non-Biblical religions, it was our intention to say something about Confucianism, the state religion of China. Had we done so, it should have been introduced three chapters ago before we touched on Buddhism since its origin was as early, or earlier than that. But the truth is, Confucianism has so little, or so few, of the ordinary fundamentals of religion about it that it seemed hardly worth while to treat of it in this particular connection, or to use it as a comparative argument for the truth of the Bible when our space was so limited and we had so much more material of a better kind. A few words may be said about it, however, in the present chapter, before we sum up the argument from Comparative Religion as a whole.

Confucius, like Buddha, was born somewhere in the 6th century B. C., and, as we have intimated, was a moral rather than a religious reformer of his time. His earlier years were given to a study of the ancient writings of his nation, and, impressed by their morality, he resolved to restore them to its attention. Rejecting revelation altogether, he confined himself so exclusively to the affairs of

earth as to render his system, according to good authorities, one of social ethics rather than religion. His philosophy was based not upon what God said, or even was supposed to have said, but upon the needs and tendencies of human nature as he understood them, or as the writings of the ancients and the facts of the past interpreted them. If Confucius, or Confucianism had, or has, any god at all, then that god is a blank, without will and without affection, whose image, to quote another, is seen in the deadness and unchangeableness of that vast empire over which he may be said to rule, "a monument of the insufficiency of earth without Heaven." Confucianism expresses itself not npon the nature or being of God, or man's relation to him as affected by sin, or the way of salvation, or the future life, or even the duty of man toward God. It lays all its emphasis upon the duty of man to his fellow-man, a duty expressed in the formula, "What you do not want done to yourself, do not to others." This is sometimes called the "Golden Rule" of Confucianism, but Christianity can well afford to stand or fall by a comparison therewith of the Golden Rule of Christ: "Whatsoever ye would that others should do unto you, do ye even so to them." The one prohibits evil, the other commands good. The one is negative, the other positive. Which, therefore, is from man, and which from God?

That there is some good in the teachings of Confucianism goes without saying. The same is

true of every false system of whatever name. It could gain no headway at all were it not so, and Satan is not averse to clothing himself as an angel of light to gain his ends. Filial piety is one of these good features of Confucianism often quoted in its favor, but it should be remembered that filial piety in Confucianism means ancestral worship, the same as we met with in Zoroastrianism or the religion of Persia. Think, on the other hand, how woman is degraded in China, and polygamy sanctioned, and kindred wrongs! So far as this may be called a religion at all, it may be said of it, as of all non-Bible religions, that the ethics of its system are so divorced from its religion that one may be very religious and very wicked at the same time.

To come now to the particular object of this chapter, a kind of summing up of all that has been said in the last half-dozen chapters, we want to emphasize for Christianity what was said for Judaism, and with the same object, viz: that it is not to be regarded merely as the sum or result of all the other religions with which it has, or may be, compared. These other religions are not so many stages in the natural development of religion of which Christianity is only the latest and best. On the contrary, Christianity is not a development or evolution at all, i. e., on the natural plane of things. Christianity is a revelation from God, full-fledged. She is not man-made in any sense, but divine. The other religions, some of them at least, may have

borrowed from her, but to accommodate the language of the old hymn:

"She gives, but borrows none."

That Mohammedanism has borrowed from her may be readily granted because of its later date, but what of Buddhism? it may be asked. We approximate an answer to this question by recalling that later accounts of the ministry of Buddha contain personal legends of his miraculous birth, his presentation in the temple, his temptation in the wilderness, etc., which are not found in the earlier ones, at once awakening the suspicion that they are copied from the Gospels and attributed to Buddha. But how could this have been accomplished?

The answer doubtless is through the penetration of Christianity into India and thereabouts at very early times, perhaps the apostolic era itself. Tradition has always affirmed this, indeed, while, on the other hand, there is not the slightest trace that Buddhism was at all known outside of the land of its birth at such a period. The same inference holds with reference to Zoroastrianism or Confucianism. It is strengthened, too, by the further fact that the date of these three religious reformers of the East, as near as we can get at it, was not far removed from that of the prophets Daniel and Ezekiel in Persia and Babylon, through whom the kings and peoples of those nations received an intellectual knowledge at least, of the Old Testament Scriptures and the revelation of the true God. Is it not a fair assumption that this knowledge pene-

trated still further in that direction? And if these religions were modified to any extent by the revelation of the Old Testament, were they not thus prepared for a further modification by the New?

But, in the second place, it should be noted that Christianity is the only religion for the reason that she alone is based on a complete revelation. There are, for example, two kinds of revelation, general and specific they have been called; but they might be designated as physical and spiritual. The first comprises all objects presenting themselves to the senses such as the material world, the mental and moral constitution of man, and the events of history. This revelation lies open to the eyes of all, and in all the ages, and is the source of what little truth there is found in the heathen religions. Moreover, this revelation is a sufficient safeguard from error if it were only read aright and understood. But man, through his own sin, has made himself incapable of doing this, as the inspired teachings of Paul in the first chapter of Romans, verses 18-25, clearly establish. The Christian alone can read this revelation in nature aright, and he is able to do it only because he has received and believed the revelation of grace, the revelation that is found in the written and incarnate Word. This is what is meant when it is said, that Christianity is the only religion because she only has a complete revelation.

Finally, Christianity is the only religion because she only is able to make her principles operative

in actual life. We have seen many points of agreement or partial agreement between Christianity and other religions so far as their sentiment or theory were concerned, but they part company altogether when those sentiments or theories are sought to be reduced to practice. Napoleon said: "Paganism has made a perfect chaos of morals;" and we ourselves have seen the truth of this remark in the preceding pages, and can set our seal to the wisdom of what Dr. Lorimer has said in his "Argument for Christianity," that "were these Eastern religions prevalent in England and America, the population would be permitted to die of its own vices."

It is true that Christendom has vices, but this is not true of Christians. It is true also that heathenism can boast of some moral examples, but taking heathenism as a whole and Christianity as a whole, what has been expressed above will remain true. Christianity has the dynamic to raise the masses of the people, diffuse education, elevate woman, protect children, establish and maintain civil and religious liberty, and in a word to do for the race what is exemplified in the best of the English-speaking nations as compared with the same in those of the Far East. We need no stronger argument, and can find no more practical one surely, for the divine origin of Christianity and hence the credibility of the Bible which alone reveals it.

CHAPTER X.

MIRACLES—THEIR DEFINITION AND PROOF.

MIRACLES, so-called ,are associated with ali false religions, and it is therefore appropriate, after considering some of those religions, to consider that one particular feature of them all, so prominent as an evidence of Christianity. It should be stated in this connection, that although professed miracles are found in other religions, yet Christianity is the only one appealing to them as an evidence of its truth.

In other words, the other religions were already established among men before miracles were added to them as a kind of necessary, or at least, desirable appendage; a fact which may at once raise the question, as to whether that does not make for the truthfulness of those religions as against Christianity? In other words, is not a religion which can be established without miracles stronger, or truer than one which requires them. To this Dr. Paley has made the apt reply, that the question is not whether a religion can be established without miracles, but whether one which appeals to miracles can be divine if the miracles are not true?

And yet, just now, there is a great disparagement of miracles as an evidence of Christianity upon the part of some of its professed friends. To

quote the language of one of them, "Christianity would float more buoyantly if its miraculous element was disregarded altogether." "Cut free the ethics of Christianity from this incubus," says Matthew Arnold, "and they alone will assert its superiority and command the allegiance of men." The motive for this disparagement is hardly within the province of these "Primers" to consider, but it might be easily shown to a humble and devout mind, that they who advance it are not the firmest and best friends of the idea of a supernatural revelation from God. It is enough to say now, however, that to accept such a hypothesis is to close one's eyes to the teaching of the whole Bible upon the question, and especially to the attitude of Jesus Christ himself.

If any one desires to consider the value which our Lord Jesus Christ puts upon his miracles, he may examine such passages in the Gospels as Matthew 11:21, 22; Luke 7:22; John 5:36; 10:25, 26; 10:37, 38; and 15:24. The eternal fate of Chorazin and Bethsaida resulted from their disregard of his miracles. John the Baptist was to be confirmed in his faith in him as the Messiah by the record of his miracles. He declares explicitly that the works which he did, and which the Father had given him to finish bore witness of him that the Father had sent him. If men would not believe him, they were asked to believe his works, and he declares explicitly in the last-named quotation from John, that it was sin on

the part of his countrymen not to believe in his miracles.

In defining a miracle, it is well to remember that there are in the New Testament four words used to express it, namely, "wonder," "sign," "work," and "power." The first applies to an event which attracts attention to the person accomplishing it; the second illustrates some spiritual truth or reveals a spiritual person; the third advances some worthy object; and the fourth brings a force to bear upon human affairs beyond nature. The full defiinition of a miracle then as given by another, is, "an event compelling attention and awakening wonder; indicating superhuman power; accomplishing some practical work; and furnishing a sign of a divine message."

As growing out of this definition of a miracle, three or four remarks may be made: For example, a miracle is not necessarily a greater manifestation of God's power than that ordinarily observed in nature, but only a different one. In the next place, a miracle is not to be regarded as a contradiction of the laws of nature, but only the setting aside of a lower by a higher law. In the third place, a miracle is not necessarily an altogether new thing in nature, but possibly an old thing under new circumstances. The plagues of Egypt were not unknown before, but the circumstances of their production by Moses made them miraculous. The great draught of fishes recorded in Luke 5 is a miracle of the same character. When a mir-

acle is altogether new, it is sometimes called, to distinguish it, an absolute miracle, and when only partially new, as in the instances just cited, a providential miracle.

The simplest way, therefore, to explain a miracle is that which refers it to the action of the divine will. This is illustrated in our own constitution where spirit is continually acting upon matter, though we know not how. So the divine will, intimately related to the material world, acts upon it in such a way as to accomplish results which otherwise could not take place. (Dods).

Strangely enough, in the estimation of many, the strongest objection ever presented against the miracles of the Bible is that of David Hume, the great English historian and deist of the eighteenth century, who declared practically, that no evidence could prove a miracle. His argument is something like this: (1), There is not in all history a miracle performed in such an intelligent quarter of the world, and in such a public manner as to render the detection of a fraud inevitable; (2), or if such a miracle could be cited, then it is not at the same time attested by a sufficient number of men of such undoubted integrity as to place them beyond all suspicion; (3), or if it could be attested by such men, then they are not of such education, acuteness and learning as to secure us against their being themselves deluded; (4), or if they are thus qualified, then they are not of such credit and repu-

tation in the world as to have a great deal to lose through being detected in a falsehood!

Doubtless the best answer to this objection is not in the region of metaphysics but of facts. His mental and moral make-up is very mysterious, to say the least, who can accept the position of David Hume in the face of the following considerations: (1). Confining ourselves simply to the miracles of the New Testament, it is to be remembered that they were very numerous. Forty are related at large in the Gospels and the Acts, without speaking of such general and sweeping references as are found in such places as Matthew 4:24, Acts 5:16, etc. (2). They were not only numerous but varied, but meeting practically every form of human need. (6), human need. (3). They were not only varied, but diffused, extending over a large territory, including Palestine, Asia, and Europe, and covering a period of at least seventy years, from the beginning of Christ's ministry to the death of John. (4). They were performed, not in small villages only, but in large cities, and simultaneously by different disciples in different places, and often before multitude of witnesses, most of whom were opposed to the religion they attested. (5). They were such as could be brought to the test of the senses, not only of the most learned, but the most ignorant. Anyone could determine whether it were really bread and fish they were eating on that day by the Sea of Galilee, and whether Lazarus really died, was buried and arose and lived again in Bethany. (6).

They were rigidly investigated, both by Jewish rulers and Roman magistrates. The Gospels and the Acts are replete with the testimony of the one, and contemporaneous history substantiates the other. (7). They were not only rigidly investigated, but also impressively corroborated by the testimony of enemies. There was the testimony of the Jews, who never reported an imposture, (compare John 11:42, Acts 2:22). There was that of the pagans like Celsus of the second, Porphyry of the third, and Julian of the fourth century, who seek to account for them on other than Christian grounds. There was the testimony of friends who became enemies, like Judas, for example, who never declared themselves deceived. There was the testimony of enemies who became friends, like Paul, the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, and hundreds of thousands since, many of whom have sealed their testimony with their blood. Finally, we have the testimony afforded by the monument of Christianity itself.

To suppose that the religion of Jesus Christ based, as it is in fact, upon miracles as one of the external evidences of its truth, could have stood the scrutiny of all these centuries and generations, and remain today in the position it occupies, if these miracles had not occurred or were not true, is a greater strain upon human credulity than to believe the opposite.

CHAPTER XI.

MIRACLES—THE FALSE AND THE TRUE.

WE CONTINUE the subject of miracles. It is sometimes said that miracles no longer occur, and on the basis of that statement, the inference is sought to be drawn that they never did occur.

But we may ask, in the accommodated language of Prof. Bettex, of Strassburg: "How do we know that miracles no longer occur? Do we know all that God is now doing for his creatures, and everything that happens in the whole world from pole to pole? Suppose that God should today answer the prayers of thousands among the millions that now inhabit our earth; suppose that he should grant gracious protection, healing or rescue, warning or prophetic dreams, angelic visitation at death to a Hindoo or to an Eskimo, a savage of Tartary or Australia, in his lowly hut or in the chase, amid polar snows or afloat upon the trackless ocean, what should we know about it? Tomorrow morning's papers would not report it.

At no time did the knowledge of a miracle being wrought become general. Most of those who heard of it either considered the incident a result of natural causes or treated the report as a myth. In Egypt, Pharaoh's drowning was no doubt thought to be caused by a sand storm or by waves of the sea. Of Christ's miracles very little was heard at

the time, even in cities so near as Alexandria and Athens. No Roman spoke of them in the forum so far as we have any record. It is doubtless true that 'to everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under heaven,' even miracles.

For example, the Bible contains no declaration that God during fifteen hundred years wrought a public miracle for the millions who lived before the flood. Moreover, it is even asserted in the Psalms that from the time of the call of Abraham, he reserved the public or outward miracle for his own people. During the four centuries of their dwelling in Egypt he performed no miracle on their behalf, for his face was turned away from them. He has rejected them now for over eighteen centuries since the crucifixion of their Messiah, and works no miracle for them of which we know, and does not answer their prayers.

Thus the era of public miracles closed with the destruction of Jerusalem, but according to the prophet Joel, a new one will begin when God shall once more have mercy upon his people Israel, and turn their captivity. Moreover, Christ said that before the terrible day of the Lord more signs and wonders should appear, as we find recorded in Matthew 24, and the corresponding places in the synoptics.

Miracles of another kind, however, are transpiring in our own time, even more marvelous, impressive, and educative, had we the eyes to see them, in the conversion of men and women from all na-

tions and tongues. They are taken hold of here and there, by day and by night, in the shop and in the field, and their nature is changed so that they love what they used to hate, and hate what they used to love; their sorrow is turned to joy, and their joy to sorrow. The world becomes to them a shadow, and Heaven the only reality. they die in peace, longing to depart, while others who have not undergone this change are beside themselves with fear. Is not this a miracle, and does it not testify currently to the credibility of the Bible?" ("The Miracle," p. p 57-60.)

One dare affirm, however, that miracles, even of the physical and outward kind, are happening continually in our own time in different parts of the world, as recorded in the annals of modern missionaries.

But this last allusion to the physical miracles that may now be occurring, necessitates a comparison between them, as well as between the true miracles of the earlier ages, and the false, or so-called miracles that have been professed in all time, and never more boldly than now. This comparison will not only go to strengthen the evidence for the true miracle, but in so doing, of course, strengthens the evidence for the Bible as the Word of God. These false miracles are of three kinds:

First, there are those altogether false in the sense that they never occurred in any shape or manner outside of the imaginations of their narrators. Some of these are recorded in the Apocryphal

Gospels, in the annals of Paganism and Romanism, and in the current reports of Spiritism and kindred cults. Many of these narrations are aimless, fantastic, and grotesque, like the story of the Child Jesus, who is said to have repaired a blunder of Joseph, his father, in building a throne for Herod, by drawing it out to its right length; or the story of St. Bernard, who is said to have excommunicated the flies from the sacred edifice in which he ministered.

Second, there are those which can be explained by natural causes, like certain wonders of the past associated with comets, eclipses, etc., marvelous indeed, but now known to have been non-miraculous; like phenomena associated with fastings, pilgrimages, and mind-cures, as well as other physical and mental causes, awakening hope, quickening expectation, and so affecting bodily cures; and like those associated with psychic force or magnetism, by which scientific men explain some of the mysteries of occultism. The instances of the Egyptian, magicians, Simon Magus, Elymas, the Philippian damsel, and those noted in 2 Thessalonians 2:9, 1 Timothy 4, and Revelation 16:13, 14, as well as other places in the Scriptures, are in point here. And yet, in speaking of these Scriptural allusions to "lying wonders," it must not be supposed that they are not in any sense real wonders. Their falsehood consists, not so much in their nature, as in the purposes for which they may be performed by Satan or his representatives.

Demoniacal possession is clearly taught in the New Testament, not merely as something past, but something yet to come, and we know from current testimony that it is something which now exists. If this be so, therefore, we need not be surprised that wonders may be performed by men, which, if possible, would deceive the very elect.

Now miracles of the New Testament are discriminated from all these false miracles in several particulars: In the first place, they were always borne witness to by contemporary evidence, while the false miracles, a certain large class of them at least, were usually unheard of until long after they were said to have occurred. Apollonius, a pagan philosopher of Asia about the time of Christ, was reported to have wrought miracles, but such report was not current until a century after his death, while his own testimony contradicts the claim which others thus made for him. The same may be said of the miracles of Mohammedanism, and of those of Loyola, the founder of the order of the Jesuits, whose earliest biographer records no miracle which he wrought, while a later biographer records a number.

In the second place, the miracles of the New Testament were always immediately and entirely successful, reference now is made especially to the healing of diseases. Moreover, Christ and his disciples, not only alleviated symptoms, but removed causes. In Grecian mythology multitudes thronged the temple of the god of healing, but only a frac-

tion ever pretended to have found relief. The tombs of the saints are credited with wonders, but events have proven many to have been only partially relieved, who afterward experienced a return of their complaints.

In the third place, the miracles of the New Testament were not abrupt, isolated occurrences, but part of an organic whole. They logically belonged to that system of revealed truth whose development had been co-terminus with the centuries. To quote the figure of another, "They are not the address of the letter which may be torn off and thrown away when the letter is identified, but the very contents of the letter itself, which reveals and certifies the writer." (Dods.)

Finally, the miracles of the New Testament are consistent with, and reveal the holiness, the goodness, and the dignity of God. They are not associated with the monstrous or the absurd; or the dark, unholy, and mysterious; or the sordid and commercial; or the desire for notoriety, or the absence of love. They are on the plane of nature and seek to remove obstructions in the way of nature to express the love of God to man.

All this teaches us, therefore, that a miracle or a wonder in itself cannot command the absolute, unquestioning obedience of man. Neither can it of itself either attest the truth of the doctrine or the divine mission of the teacher. Those things must be proven on other grounds, but when so proven, the miracles will in their attestation thus

attest and seal them beyond peradventure. When the teaching associated with the miracle fails to commend itself as good and true, the miracle should be regarded as a warning against the teaching, rather than a witness in its favor. The Scripture passages already alluded to, substantiate this statement.

We thus see that the safeguard against the false miracle lies, not so much in the region of the intellect, as the heart. The moral and spiritual condition of the man, rather than his great learning or ability, must determine his capacity to perceive truth on the one hand, or to be deceived by error on the other. Eminent men have been followers of Christian Science, Spiritualism, and other false teachings, substantiated by "lying wonders," the explanation of which is only to be found in the remarks just made. Compare Psalm 25:14, 15, Matthew 11:25, 1 John 4:1.

CHAPTER XII.

PROPHECY—ITS VALUE.

PROPHECY, like miracles, is a feature more or less associated with different forms of paganism; but the prophecy of the Bible is so distinct therefrom as to mark it unmistakably divine; and being so, it becomes an incontrovertible evidence of the divinity of the religion of which it is a part.

Prophecy is a communication by God to man of a knowledge of events still future, which otherwise he could not have discovered. As such, therefore, it furnishes an argument for the credibility of the Bible, whose force is continually growing. Beginning when the first prophecy was fulfilled, and increasing as fulfillments increase, its maturity will not be reached until the end of the world. In this respect, the evidence it affords differs from that of miracles, that while they furnished the more impressive testimony for the beginning of Christianity, this does so for its close.

The full weight of prophecy can only be gathered from a comprehensive view of its immense scheme as shown in the pages of the whole Bible; each dispensation has its own predictions, beginning with man's fall in Eden, and ending in his restoration in the day of the new heavens and the new earth.

There are certain criteria by which prophecy

must be judged, and on which its evidential value must depend:—

First, it must concern events which no human sagacity could discover.

Second, it must be known before the event takes place.

Third, it must be sufficiently clear in statement, and yet sufficiently minute in detail, to identify its fulfillment beyond the possibility of dispute.

Fourth, it would add to its evidential value did it contain an element of obscurity or mystery which only the fulfillment could explain.

Fifth, there must be no collusion or fraudulent intention of fulfillment on the part of the human agents concerned.

Sixth, it should be worthy of God in its character and design.

Quoting Dr. A. T. Pierson here, one is justified in saying that Bible prophecy amply fulfills these criteria. "Philosophical historians or statesmen may forecast national convulsions or social revolutions by studying the annals of the past, and watching the development of current events, but the predictions of the whole Bible are almost wholly outside the range of probability or precedent."

Moses' prediction of Israel's history in Deuteronomy 28 is an illustration in point. How improbable the Babylonian captivity, the Roman siege, the present scattered, persecuted, and yet expectant condition, of that people clearly indicated even before their inception as a nation! Take again

the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah or Ezekiel concerning the downfall and overthrow of the great capitals of Nineveh, of Babylon, the desolation of Tyre, and the debasement of mighty Egypt, to say nothing of their predictions, and those of others, touching the personal history of the Messiah.

Furthermore, Bible prophecy enters astonishingly into details. An examination of the subject has shown that "in each of the more prominent subjects of prophecy, there are from twenty to forty particulars, while in those concerning the Messiah, there are no less than three hundred minutiae, making the chances of accidental co-incidence less than one in ten thousands of millions."

Again, think of the remoteness of time between many of the Bible prophecies and the period of their fulfillment, in some instances a score of years, in others, a score of centuries. "The whole of the Old Testament was in the hands of the Jews four hundred centuries before Christ, and yet their predictions were not only borne out by events, but are still in the course of fulfillment before our eyes." "Nor should we omit to observe or emphasize," says Prof. S. H. Kellogg, in his great work on the Jews, "that the essential facts which bear upon this matter are not affected by any questions which modern criticism has raised as to the dates of the several books which contain the predictions. Let every book in which any of these predictions are found be brought down to the latest date which the most radical criticism would claim;

still, however the question of the real predictive character of certain prophecies might be affected thereby, it would yet remain true that we have here a large residuum of veritable prophecy, which was undeniably written long before the actual occurrences of the events foretold. And while it may be admitted that many other prophecies which refer to the Babylonian exile were published shortly before that event, yet it is to be noted that these contain many particulars which were not realized until centuries after."

Consider finally, the mysteriousness and obscurity of many of these predictions. What paradoxes they contain, adding greatly as they do to their supernatural character. For example, any one can see that "many of the events and circumstances foretold of Israel, are as far as possible from being such as would in that day have naturally occurred to the mind of a patriotic Israelite endeavoring to forecast the future of his nation and country."

Indeed, they were offensive to his pride and contradictory to the fixed religious beliefs of his nation, in evidence of which we have the fact that they were almost unanimously disbelieved by the great majority of the people to whom they were addressed. The prophets were severely persecuted and sometimes put to death for giving utterances to such things. See Jer. 7:4, Ezek. 11:2, 3, Micah 3:11.

This feature of mysteriousness and obscurity is especially conspicuous in the prohecies concerning

the Messiah, of which a large number are mentioned by Dr. Pierson in "The Gordion Knot." For example, He was to be a root out of dry ground, and yet a fruitful branch; a sufferer unto death, and yet not holden of death; without offspring, yet possessing numerous seed; condemned as a malefactor, yet justifying transgressors. These contradictions, it has been well said, present a problem no human wisdom was able to solve. To Jewish rabbis they seemed altogether irreconcilable, and suggested the idea of two Messiahs united in the one great work. And yet, God meant the utterances to be obscure for later generations to decipher or interpret, and in the doing of it, to bear all the stronger testimony to their unquestioned truth.

"How different heathen oracles when compared with these! How unwilling to claim the sanction of varied and minute detail! How they hid ignorance of the future by ambiguity and deceit! How trivial and venal their responses to their interrogators! All the world knows the story of Croesus who was told by the Delphic oracle that by crossing the Haly's he would destroy a great empire, but whether it were his own or the Persian, he was not told. It proved to be his own. The oracle of Dodona encouraged the Athenians 'to establish themselves in Sicily,' but when as a result of their effort they were beaten by the Syracusans, they were adroitly told it was not that Sicily that was meant, but a little hill near Athens! These, and

countless other illustrations, might be given to show the crafty impositions of these oracles, for the substantiation of which, we need have recourse to none other than heathen authorities themselves, six hundred of whom are reported by Eusebius as on record in opposition to the oracles. Indeed the latter ceased to be appealed to altogether about the middle of the fourth century B. C." (The Gordion Knot.)

CHAPTER XIII.

PROPHECY—ITS NATURE.

AFTER considering the evidential value of the prophecies of the Bible, it is necessary to say a few words about their nature or character. There are some seven hundred distinct prophecies in the Bible, which, for convenience, may be divided according to their fulfillments into several classes:—

First, there are those whose fulfillments took place in the earlier history of the Jews, as, for example, their Egyptian bondage, Gen. 15:13, 14, compared with the opening chapters of Exodus; the division of the kingdom, 1 Kings 11:29-35, compared with chapter 12:16, 17; the Babylonian captivity, Isaiah 39:5-8, compared with 2 Kings 24:10-16, or Jeremiah 29:10, with the contents of the book of Ezra.

Secondly, there are the fulfillments in the history of the nations other than the Jews. Noah predicted the history of his descendants as recorded in Gen. 9:25-27. Canaan's offspring are still servants, and Japheth is enlarged and dwells in the tents of Shem. This latter is true, whether it be construed politically or religiously, for Europe controls Asia, while the religion of Asia (Shem), has been adopted by Europe. Balaam predicted the judgment upon the Amalekites, Kenites, and

Assyrians, see Numbers 24:20-24. Moses predicted the rise of the Roman power, Deut. 27:49 and the following. Daniel predicted the succession of the Babylonian, Persian, Grecian and Roman powers, chapters 2, 7, 9. Isaiah (23), Joel (3), Ezekiel (26-28), Amos (1), and Zechariah (9), unite in foretelling the destruction of Tyre. Nahum (1, 3), and Zephaniah (2), foretell the destruction of Nineveh. Isaiah (13, 14, 44. 45), and Jeremiah (50, 51), foretell the destruction of Babylon.

Third, there are the fulfillments in the personal history of Jesus Christ. "To him give all the prophetic witness." He was to be born of the seed of the woman, itself an apparently contradictory expression, (Gen. 3:15); of the stock of Abraham, (Gen. 22:18); of the tribe of Judah, (Gen. 49:10); of the family of David, (Jer. 23:5); in the town of Bethlehem, (Micah 5:2); at a particular date. (Daniel 9:24). The scene of his early ministry was foretold in Isaiah 9:1; his sufferings and death, Ps. 22, Isaiah 53; his resurrection and ascension, Ps. 16:8-11, and Ps. 68:18, compared with Ephesians 4:8 and the following verses.

There are, in the fourth place, the fulfillments in the later history of the Jews, the Gentile nations and the Christian church. To begin with the Jews in Deut. 28, already referred to, there is a frightful prophecy of calamities to come upon them, which we have only to lay alongside of current history as recorded in the daily press in order

to see fulfilled in horrible minuteness before our eyes. But in such places as Numbers 22:9, Jeremiah 30:11, there are other prophecies of their continuance as a people notwithstanding their sufferings. And they still continue.

Under less than half of their calamities other peoples have passed away, leaving a name only to survive them. But the Jews have not passed away. Without a country of their own for nearly two thousand years, everywhere despised, hunted, and slaughtered, excluded from civil privileges, denied the exercise of their religion, they are still amongst us, solitary but not secluded, distinct in character, indeed, as when they dwelt in Palestine.

History cannot match this. Always the immigrant merges into the peoples among whom he comes, but the Jew never. The Arabians, descendants of Ishmael, half brothers of the Jews, are quite as ancient, but have had no such experience. They are still where they always were. But the Jew, in his imperishable race-identity, is the standing miracle of the ages. When Frederick the Great asked his chaplain to give him in one word a demonstration of the truth of the Bible, he replied, "The Jew, your Majesty."

In Amos 9:11-15, Hosea 3, Isaiah 2, Ezek. 37, and other places, too numerous even to indicate, it is prophesied that Israel shall be restored to Palestine, and ultimately, after her conversion to Jesus as the Messiah, become the head of the nations. It may be premature to speak of the fulfilling of

these prophecies today, but such intimations may be referred to as the material awakening in Palestine, the tide of Jewish immigration in that direction, the rapid rise of individual Jews to power and eminence, their possession of great wealth, their organization for national ends as illustrated by "Zionism," the decay of the Turkish power, the illegal owner and possessor of their land, the increasing interest of Gentiles in their physical and political condition, the focusing of statecraft upon the international problems of the East, and the movements of the nations in that quarter of the globe.

For a full and interesting consideration of these things, and one that will contribute in no slight degree to the confirmation of the prophetic Scriptures, one should read such a work as that of Prof. S. H. Kellogg, already alluded to, on "The Jews, Prediction and Fulfillment." (Revell Pub. Co.).

We might, in the fifth place, speak of the later fulfillments in the history of the Gentile nations, returning again to the consideration of Daniel's prophecy of the four empires. The last of these empires was to be divided into ten kingdoms at the last, as symbolized by the feet and toes of the metal image. (Chapter 2:40-43). Biblical scholarship is practically a unit in applying this to the Roman empire in its present form. The precise division into ten kingdoms is not yet apparent indeed, but the political material out of which they shall be formed—the iron mixed with miry clay—

monarchial institutions tempered with democratic policies, is so peculiarly a mark of the current age, as distinguishing it from every preceeding one, as almost to compel conviction of its application. Pusey's work on Daniel, Tregelles on the same book, B. W. Newton on "Prophetic Inquiry," and more recently, Ford C. Ottman on "The Unfolding of the Ages," are very helpful to read here.

Christ's prophecy in the twenty-fourth of Matthew comes into view in the same connection, especially verses 3-14, which give a kind of panorama of the events occurring between his departure into Heaven and his return again, which the history of all the intervening years, as well as the present time, had demonstrated to be true. To this might be added Paul's words to Timothy in his second epistle, chapter 3:1-5. The "perilous" or grievous times coming in the "last days," of which he speaks, are evidently upon us. It is true that such men as he there refers to have always been in evidence in the world, but the point is this, that according to the worldly notion of things, they should not have been expected to have been in evidence at this late period. A false and unintelligent optimism has been looking for better things in the "last days," and yet, these are the things we have, just as the Bible predicted, which affords a strong confirmation of its truth.

Finally, we might speak of the later fulfillments in the history of the church. We recall that Jesus asked, "When the Son of man cometh, shall he

find the faith on the earth?" Luke 18:8, R. V. Also that Paul tells us in 2 Thessalonians 2 that there shall come a "falling away," or an apostasy, in the church, to be headed up in the "man of sin." Should any one wish to see the fulfillment, in part at least, of these predictions in our own time, and an evident preparation for the fulfillment of all in the time to come, he has only to open his eyes and look about him without prejudice. Andrew's "Christianity and Anti-Christianity," will greatly strengthen his vision in this respect. The things to which he calls our attention in that book are sometimes denominated "pessimism," but they are really a contribution to the strongest optimism. The fulfillment of the dark side of the prophetic future is a guaranty of the fulfillment of the bright side. "The night cometh, and also the morning." And the latter is very bright. It is simply a question as to whether the clouds and tempest are already past, or whether the more dangerous coasts are yet to be passed, and a possible storm confronted before we reach the desired haven. The prophetic Word says that the latter is true, and the signs of the times point in the same direction. This is a reason for hopefulness rather than discouragement, and is, as has been said, a confirmation of the credibility of the Bible.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE IDEA OF JESUS CHRIST.

IN AN earlier part of this work it was stated that occasional tribute would be made on a former publication of the writer along the same line, entitled, "The Bulwarks of the Faith," which will be the case in what is now to be said about the idea of Jesus Christ as a confirmation of the credibility of the Bible.

To the writer's mind there is no testimony to the divine original of the Bible comparable to the revelation it offers of the Person of him whom we have come to know as the God-Man. Reference is not intended to what he himself said about the Bible, which has been referred to in other connections in volume I., but to what he himself is, as presented to us in its text, especially in the Gospels.

The uniqueness of his character is the most conspicuous human fact in the history of the world. The testimony of his enemies at the time that "Never man spake like this man," has been repeated by the profoundest scholarship in all the ages since; and with the testimony has come the ever-recurring question, "How hath this man letters, having never learned?" His power was so astonishing as to compel the exclamation even from those reluctant to acknowledge his Messiah-

ship, "When Christ cometh, will he do more miracles than these which this man hath done?" His humility and self-sacrifice are as astonishing as his power, presenting features of a character which were not true of any heroes of antiquity.

His dignity and majesty were equally incomparable, and we may well say with Theodore Parker, that there was "supremacy in every attitude and aspect of his life." No one ever ventured on a liberty with Jesus Christ. He never fled through fear. He was never carried away by success, or driven to despondency by opposition. No enemy ever overrode him, and Satan never baffled him. Never did he apologize for anything he said or did, retrace a step he took, or recall a word he spake.

He, of all the human beings who ever lived, could challenge his contemporaries with the question, "Which of you convinces me of sin?" The sinlessness of Jesus is the very essence of that uniqueness of which we speak. His enemies testify to this as do his friends. Their reproaches were for his virtues rather than his faults. Judas, as well as Pilate, finds no fault in him, who confessed that he had betrayed innocent blood. Paul once spoke of himself as the "chief of sinners," and the disciple whom Jesus loved declared, "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves," but Jesus never accused himself like this. Was his soul less refined than theirs, his spiritual sensibilities less keen, or does this mean that he "was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin?" As

Canon Liddon says, "The pores of the soul are always open, and instinctively, whether a man will or no, the insignificance or the greatness of his inner life reveals itself." Had Jesus therefore known of sin in his own experience, it must have shown itself somewhere, somehow, in his outer life and speech, but, wonder of wonders! never did this Galilean peasant ask to be forgiven, or betray the faintest consciousness of imperfection or demerit. The ideal Man was he, the perfect Man! But he was more.

The background of his absolutely holy character gives compelling weight to his stupendous claim to be the Son of God. The utmost sanity and sobriety were associated with this claim. He framed an argument to demonstrate it as recorded in the fifth of John. What inference is to be drawn from this? What testimony to the credibility of the record which contains it? Where did this conception or idea of Jesus Christ originate? Shall we regard it as fallacious? Is it a creation of the brains of the evangelists, or did the Person himself actually exist before their eyes? If the evangelists were good men, could they have been capable of such a fraud? Of if bad men, could they have been capable of painting such a character? Is not holiness as alien to the wicked as light is to the blind? Is not the power of describing character the greatest of the literary art? And where could a tax collector or fisherman have obtained this art?

Moreover, as others have pointed out, the evan-

gelists do not even attempt to delineate the character of Jesus Christ, or to dilate upon his goodness or eulogize his merits. Seldom, if ever, do they intermingle their own reflections with what he said or did, recording the same in frank admission, time and time again, of their own weakness or inability to comprehend him. And yet they have given us a portrait, and the only portrait in the world, of a God-man and a glorious Savior. Dr. Moorehead has well said that men could no more imagine or invent this character than they could create a world, and even with the character before them, they must have had the assistance of the Holy Ghost.

Now the bearing of all this upon the truth of the Gospels not only, but through them upon the truth of the whole Bible, must be very clear. In the earlier publication referred to, infidel testimony was quoted to this effect. The strongest objectors to the principles of Christianity have been compelled to ask, "How could such men as the human authors of the Gospels conceive of such a man as Jesus Christ?" Where could they have found a model to have copied from? The ideal of the Jews would have been a scribe or pharisee, that of the Romans a warrior, that of the Greeks a philosopher possessing the mingled vices and virtues of a Socrates, for example, but where could a suggestion of Jesus Christ be found, had he not lived before the eyes of men? But if this be true, does

it not prove the credibility of the record of which it is the central fact?

"It is more inconceivable," said Rousseau, the great infidel and profligate philosopher, "that a number of persons should agree to write such a history, than that one should furnish the subject of it; the marks of truth are so striking and inimitable, that the inventor would be a more astonishing character than the hero."

CHAPTER XV.

CHRISTIANITY OVERCOMING DIFFICULTIES.

I HAVE always felt that the growth of Christianity in the early centuries constituted, under the circumstances, one of the strongest evidences of the truth of the New Testament, and hence of the whole Bible. Bishop McIlvaine in his interesting work, already alluded to, has about as thrilling and impressive a chapter on this subject as I have ever read, and from him I have the suggestion and inspiration of what follows.

He begins by considering the difficulties, such as (1), the novelty of introducing a new and exclusive religion. Paganism had seldom, if ever, been propagated from place to place as was true of Christianity. It had grown up here and there out of the depraved dispositions of men, and had no principles to contend for and no creed worth disseminating. One pagan nation felt that the religion of its neighbor was on the whole as good as its own, and for the most part to be let alone. And if Christianity had been content to stand on this platform with the others, without insisting upon its right to stand alone and separate from them, paganism would have been willing to tolerate it. But the representatives of Christianity were at

once brought into conflict with pagan institutions, prejudices and interests the world over. The Parliament of Religions, held in this country at the time of the World's Fair, has done something to lower the standard of Christianity in this respect, and by making it more friendly with the other religions, diminished their respect for it and its power over them, but it was not so at the beginning, even at great cost.

Then, (2), there was the novelty of introducing a religion which was at the same time a rule of moral conduct. Religion among the pagans, as we have seen in some of the preceding chapters, consisted in the outward circumstances of temples, altars, images, priests, sacrifices and the like, divorced from any system of morals whatsoever. Worshippers might indulge in the vilest passions, but if their ritualistic practices were faithfully observed, they were in good religious standing. The holy and self-denying virtues of Christianity were of course repugnant to such worshippers as these, meeting with their disdain and arousing their bitter opposition.

(3), We have the opposition of the priests. That of the Jewish priests we have been made sufficiently familiar with in the New Testament. We know how they persecuted Jesus and hanged him on the tree; we know also how they persecuted the early apostles and disciples, and how finally all the latter were driven out of Jerusalem. But the opposition of the heathen priests

soon began to be experienced, as illustrated in the treatment of Paul at Lystra, and became ever after stronger and more bitter. The reason for this is very clear, since the religious rites of the pagans were interwoven with every circumstance of business and pleasure in private and public life. That trades flourished by the patronage of the priests is well illustrated in the historic instance of Demetrius, the silversmith of Ephesus, as recorded in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts. Moreover, these religious rites attracted the people by the great festivals and games associated with them, so that to undermine their influence aroused far stronger opposition than to attempt the destruction of the liquor traffic in our day, or to do away with base and foot-ball. The priests themselves were the admired of the people, and the greatest men of Rome aspired to that sacred office. A religion to surmount such obstacles must be one whose origin is divine.

(4), To the opposition of the priests should be added that of the magistrates, for not to worship the national gods was an unpardonable offense against the civil authority. In Rome the state itself was supreme, and was worshipped in the person of the emperor, and hence, to fail in such allegiance was treason of the rankest kind. The arm of the law must be raised in no uncertain manner against those who refused to worship idols.

(5), All these difficulties are increased by considering the peculiar character of the age in which

Christianity or the religion of the New Testament had its birth. It was one of profound peace among the nations, when they had time to investigate the claims of Christianity. It was also one of great intellectual development—the Augustan age, when they had the capacity to investigate those claims.

We sometimes speak in tones of pride about the intellectualism of the present century, but a religion which could stand the test of the first century has very probably nothing to fear from the investigation of the twentieth. That age furthermore was one of great scepticism, when they had every disposition to question the supernatural, quite as much so as at the present time. The lower classes of the first and second centuries of Christianity were very superstitious indeed, but the upper classes were opponents of all religion. It was therefore an unfavorable time for the propagation of such a religion as the Gospel, unless it was of God.

Finally, there are the circumstances under which the work of propagating this new religion was begun. With the exception of Paul and Luke, the apostles and early disciples were for the most part uneducated, uninfluential, despised Jews. They were not esteemed by their own people, they were very few in number, and they began the work under depression and discouragement from the fact that many supposed their Master to be dead. Moreover, they were under the ban of the government, and were arrested and imprisoned again and again. Yet their methods were very bold, courting no fa-

vors, conciliating no classes, but speaking with authority nevertheless. They met the fiercest persecution as they went their way, they were beaten, scourged, stoned, and later on thrown to the wild beasts in the amphitheater, and burned as torches in Nero's garden; but still they persevered and were successful.

CHAPTER XVI.

CHRISTIANITY MEETING WITH SUCCESS.

AFTER calling our attention to some of the difficulties which the religion of the New Testament met and overcame, McIlvaine goes on to speak in detail of the success achieved:

(1). For example, on the fiftieth day after their Lord's death 3,000 souls were converted by the testimony of the disciples according to the story in Acts II. In a few days this number was increased to five thousand (Acts 4.) In about a year and a half, though the Gospel had not yet been proclaimed outside of Jerusalem, multitudes were obedient to the faith, and among them a great company of the priests (Acts 5-6). Persecuted at Jerusalem, the disciples went everywhere preaching the Word, and in three years churches were scattered throughout Judea, Galilee and Samaria (Acts 7-9). Within five years the Gospel had been preached to the Gentiles with even greater results as we gather from Acts 17, 19, 21.

At the close of chapter fifteen, we read of Paul and Silas departing from Antioch and going through "Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches," although up until that time not the slightest

mention of such churches had been made in the record. This gives us a hint of the way in which the church may have spread at that time far beyond any mention. Paul's letters give other intimations of the same thing. Moreover, these Scriptural statements and hints are abundantly corroborated by Tacitus, the Roman historian, and Pliny the Roman governor of Bithynia, the latter of whom testified that the pagan temples were almost entirely deserted because of the growth of Christianity.

(2). This achievement is rendered all the more remarkable by the fact that nothing corresponding to it has ever been known before or since. Sometimes the progress of Mohammedanism has been compared with it, but our author points out the following differences:—

(A). Mohammed did not profess to work miracles, and hence had no detection to fear.

(B) He himself was of the most powerful family in Mecca, and although poor by inheritance, became rich by marriage. Jesus' family was obscure and he had nowhere to lay his head.

(C). Mohammed began his work among the rich and great, but Jesus among the poor. In the first three years Mohammed had attached to his cause thirty of the chief people of Mecca; Jesus had attached to his cause twelve uninfluential Jews. Of the thirty Mohammedans all subsequently attained commands of armies and the government of

kingdoms. The contrast in the case of the twelve disciples need not be emphasized.

(D). Mohammed set up his religion in an age of ignorance, Jesus in one of intellectual light. Mohammed in an interior town of Arabia, Jesus in the metropolis of Judea. Mohammed among a barbarous people, Jesus among a cultivated one.

(E). Mohammed's methods were politic, those of Jesus polemic. Mohammed pretended to restore the purity of the Christian religion instead of attacking it, the apostles attacked all the religions of the world. Mohammed required no self-denial of his followers and sanctioned their strongest passions. Christianity repelled unregenerate human nature in every form.

(F). At the end of twelve years Mohammedanism had not extended beyond Mecca, while in that time Christianity had spread over Judea, Galilee and Samaria.

(G). Mohammed finally spread his cause at the edge of the sword. Christianity for the first three centuries at least, continued its way by persuasion. It was not until the fourth century and the age of Constantine, that the sword was introduced into Christianity, and then began the dark ages of Christianity from which it did not emerge until the Reformation. Mohammed's success was that of the warrior, Jesus that of a teacher and a Savior.

This chapter should not conclude without a reference, however brief, to the present as well as the early successes of Christianity. It is true that nine-

teen centuries have elapsed and Christianity has not yet conquered the world for Christ, but it was pointed out in one of our chapters on prophecy that this was foreknown and foretold, and that the fact is a corroboration of the truth of the Bible.

The rise of the apostasy at about the fourth century of the Christian era, or soon after the ascendancy and so-called conversion of Constantine, marks the introduction of the dark ages, as they have come to be known, when, under the paralyzing influence of the papacy, the true missionary spirit became very nearly extinct. This spirit has been marvelously revived within the past century, a concrete illustration of which is found in the fact that the British and Foreign Bible Society, which has just celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of its foundation, has during that period published and distributed nearly two hundred millions of copies of the Bible and the New Testament. The American Bible Society, formed in 1816, has issued over seventy-two millions of copies additional, and yet, these are only two of the agencies for printing and distributing the Bible. Besides these, millions upon millions of Bibles have been printed and sold by other publishers.

It has been translated into one hundred languages, the New Testament into one hundred more, and parts of it into nearly two hundred other languages and dialects. Practically, the Bible can now be read in every human speech, and even many written languages have been created that its

contents might be brought to the knowledge of the people who speak them.

To this fact about the Bible might be added another concerning the missionary movement of the past century, which within the present generation, for example, has achieved greater results, according to a numerical standard, than during the preceding three generations put together. Quoting the language of John R. Mott, not only have large and increasing numbers of people been won for Christ, but far greater numbers have been brought within the range of the influence of the missionary movement.

He quotes Prof. Warnack to say, that "The success of missions is far in excess of the statistical results," which success includes the revolutionizing of family, social and national ideas and customs. "The most powerful and fruitful revivals ever experienced in Asia and Africa have occurred within the past ten years. This is also true of Japan, Korea, Manchuria, China, India, the Levant, Uganda, Livingstonia and the Congo. At present in India a far larger number of people are asking for Christian teachers and preachers than were actually brought into the church during an entire generation of modern missions beginning with Carey."

Whole villages are ready to give up their worship for idols, so that Bishop Thoburn, an expert on the subject, has expressed the deep conviction that if the Protestant churches of the United States would unite together in the effort, within ten years,

there might be ten millions of people in India, now worshipping idols, either gathered within the pale of the Christian church, or inquiring the way thither.

To quote Mr. Mott still further, "The splendid successes of Christianity have served to arouse, and in some cases, to alarm the non-Christian religions, so that they are being put on the defensive. In some quarters there is a bitter reaction against the religion of Christ. This is particularly true of Hinduism and Mohammedanism. Finding that they cannot successfully meet Christianity on the ground of its historical character and results, and furthermore that the weapons of persecution are powerless to resist its onward march, they have resorted to the dangerous course of compromise, and are adopting the agencies and methods, and even some of the ideas of Christianity, as is witnessed in the organization of the Young Men's Buddhist Associations in Japan, for example. They are appealing to the patriotic motive and spirit by magnifying the national and racial associations of their traditional faiths."

Our space will not permit further allusions along this line, but those who are interested will find that interest greatly quickened by an acquaintance with almost any current missionary literature.

CHAPTER XVII.

CHRISTIANITY JUDGED BY ITS HISTORICAL EFFECTS.

WE propose to close our consideration of the credibility of the Bible with a single chapter on the evidence to be drawn from the historical effects of the religion it reveals. The late Dr. Richard S. Storrs is the author of about as useful and interesting a book on this subject as I am acquainted with, and although it is about twenty years old, it can hardly be improved upon. There are, of course, current illustrations of the theme which might be added to it from time to time in the history of the nations and the progress of Christian missions, but otherwise he has given us a classic on the subject, which will always possess the same value. The precise title of the book is, "The Divine Origin of Christianity as Shown in its Historical Effects," and I mention it as a useful book for every Christian household to possess and read. I have drawn upon it more or less in what follows.

For example, take the case of the treatment of slaves prior to the incoming of the Gospel. Among the Romans it was the custom to put their aged and useless slaves to perish on an island in the Tiber, drown them as food for their fish-ponds, or pit them against wild beasts in the amphitheater.

And these slaves, moreover, were not even of a darker color or inferior race than themselves, but prisoners of war who were their physical and intellectual equals.

Take the case of children. Among the Romans they had no rights either of life or liberty which fathers were bound to respect. They, too, might be abandoned to wild beasts or otherwise slain at pleasure, should it not be desired to rear them. They might be given in marriage without their consent, just as is the case today in India and other heathen, though civilized, lands. They might be excluded from the household even at maturity and others adopted in their stead. The children of the poor might be sold for bread.

Take the case of women. In Greece they were excluded from public affairs and the education provided for men. Daughters legally inherited nothing from their fathers, wives could conclude no bargains on their own account, and in Rome at least, husbands had qualified, if not absolute power over the lives of their wives, while at the husband's death, the wife could not be the legal guardian of her own children.

Take the case of men. In former days the individual man was absorbed in the state or nation to which he belonged, and to which he owed unlimited allegiance. He was its appendage or slave, rather than the rightful recipient of its favors. The spirit of caste ruled, and the highest privileges of

life and citizenship were confined to a limited oligarchy.

Take the case of nations. Formerly one nation was generally regardless of the welfare or rights of another. Pretexts were easily found for war, and the latter was generally carried on for pillage or conquest only. Grievous restrictions were laid upon the entrance, residence or travel of foreigners, and prisoners taken in war might be killed or enslaved at the will of their captors. It is still true, of course, that wars continue, and that they will continue until the end of the age, but arbitration is in the air, and nations are at least obliged to have a cause for war which will justify it in the light of their sister nations. Moreover, public sentiment influences them very strongly in the conduct of prisoners of war in these days is well illustrated by our treatment of Admiral Cervera and his men during our Spanish war, and the arrangement more recently entered into between Russia and Japan on the same subject. Other changes that have been brought about in these and other respects will suggest themselves to many.

Early Christian historians report the Roman nobility and their slaves as sitting down together as brethren at the Lord's table. Today, slavery is dead or dying the world over. When parental affection in individual cases fails to protect and educate children, the law of the land steps in to do so. Women are emancipated legally, morally, and in-

tellectually. The individual man is more and more regarded as superior to rank, learning, or wealth, and respect is paid to him as man wherever found. There are, of course, exceptions to this rule, but they prove the rule.

That the Gospel is to be credited with these changes is evident for a number of reasons. In the first place, it is the only new force that has entered into the world capable of producing such changes. Some would attribute them to civilization merely, but what are the elements of civilization? Are they not commerce and navigation, wealth and power, science and art? But did not the nations just referred to possess these elements of civilization, and were they not civilized? Is it not true that we are still enjoying the results of the civilization of Rome and Greece? And what about modern nations like India, China and Japan? Surely these are civilized, and yet have they not been, and are they not now destitute of some of these things we have been speaking about, except as they have been influenced by Christianity to adopt them?

In the second place, and growing out of the last remark, is it not the clear teaching of history that similar changes always follow in the wake of the promulgation of the Gospel in our own day? What about the missionary annals of Patagonia, Australia, Madagascar, Africa and the islands of the Pacific Ocean? Have not cannibals been humanized, human sacrifices abolished, moral abominations purified, education diffused, and churches, school-

houses, and orphan asylums erected in those places within the memory of our own generation?

America itself is a similar illustration. According to Prof. Bryce of England, "In the American Republic humanity has reached the highest level of material well-being." But, as Dr. Barrows says, "America was born of the Bible." This accounts for the colonization of our shores by the Pilgrims and Puritans, it explains the origin of our form of self-government both in town and church, our Christian education, our observance of the Lord's Day, and in fact, the fundamental principle of our constitution that all men are created free and equal in the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Those Christian believers who hold the Bible in their hands are making the most extensive conquests today in the whole world, so that we may well say in the language of another, "Remove from modern civilization the intellectual, moral, social and spiritual effects which have come directly or indirectly from the spirit and teaching of the Gospels, and there will be nothing left to distinguish it from the vast ocean of cruelty, superstition and despair in which went down the sun of Rome."

PART III.

How We Know the Bible is Divine

CHAPTER I.

THE MEANING OF INSPIRATION.

WE have now considered in outline some of the ground to be covered in determining the genuineness and credibility of the Bible. But just as a book may be genuine and not credible, so it may be credible and not divine in the sense that it is inspired of God.

There are many books written by men of no higher source of inspiration than that common to men, and yet they are true books in every detail, and to be depended upon in the government of human affairs. But the claim made for the Bible is that it is not only true, absolutely so, but that the source of its inspiration throughout is God. And by this it is not meant that God inspired its writing in the general sense that he inspires everything, because he gives life and is himself the Life of everything; but that he inspired it in the particular sense that he guided, directed and controlled the human writers in accurately and inerrantly setting forth the revelation of himself and his will to man, which is found, and could be found, nowhere else.

Of course, when we speak of this accurate and inerrant revelation of his will, we are referring to the original autographs of the Holy Scriptures, to the writings as they came in the first place from the hands of Moses, Samuel, David and the prophets, and later from the evangelists and apostles of the New Testament. We are not speaking of any translation or copy of these original Scriptures, however true they may be to those originals. And we are not speaking of these, because, as we have already learned, there are variant readings in them and apparent discrepancies, the results of mistaken copyists and other causes, which would always prevent them from being considered as absolutely perfect. But this was not true, and in the nature of the case, could not have been true of the originals.

Also, when we speak of the inspiration of the original Scriptures, we are speaking of the record only; that is, of the writings, and not necessarily of the human writers themselves, or any of the human speakers who are referred to or quoted from. This is a distinction necessary to be kept in mind in order to avoid confusion of thought and apparently contradictory statements. For example, the human writers were themselves more or less mistaken in their thought at times. Surely it was a mistake for Moses to desire to be blotted out of God's book (Exodus 32:32); or for David to think that there was but a step between him and death (1 Samuel 20:3); or for Paul not to know

that Ananias was the high priest (Acts 23:5); or for Peter to dissemble at Antioch (Galatians 2:14).

But while the writers may have thus been mistaken in their thought, the only consistent theory of inspiration is that they were never so as to their words written in Holy Scripture. The writings were always inspired writings, though they were not always inspired men.

Again, every word spoken or written in the Bible is not itself necessarily a true word, and in that sense a word of God. Satan's words in the Garden of Eden were not God's words, and they were not true. This is the case also with some of the false prophets who subsequently essayed to speak in God's name, though unauthorized to do so. It is true of the Pharisees who said to Christ, "Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil." Since then, these words were not God's words, and were not in themselves true, how can it be said that the Bible as to its contents is the Word of God throughout and absolutely inerrant as to its original?

The answer has been already stated that what we are contending for is the record. God has caused it to be written down under his dictation and control, that so and so spake and that such and such words were used, even though the speaker was his enemy and what he said was altogether false. The book of Ecclesiastes is in point here. It was written by Solomon as we have reason to believe, and is part of the inspired record of God, but it contains many things that are not true, or

only half true at the best. Nevertheless, God caused them to be written down for our learning, for reasons that have been considered in the first of these "Primers" where we dealt with the genuineness of the Scriptures. These considerations help us also to approximate an answer to that oft-repeated question as to whether the Bible is the Word of God, or only contains the Word of God? It only contains the Word of God in the sense that his own utterances form a slight portion of it, but it is the Word of God in the sense that he caused and inspired every word of it to be written just as it at first appeared.

But someone may say, Is not this question after all only academic? What is the use of contending for an inspired original when we do not possess it? No one claims the original autographs to be now existent, we have only translations at the best. Why then insist upon an inerrant source?

The answer is in the first place, that consistency demands it. The Scriptures themselves claim such an inerrant source, as we shall see by and by, and hence we can do no less.

In the second place, God's honor is at stake here. To quote an apt though homely remark of Dr. Burrell, used by the author in his "Bulwarks of the Faith," "A man who wears a pair of patched trousers may have little interest in knowing that they were whole when they came from the tailor's hands, but not so in the case of the tailor. His reputation demands that they shall have been per-

fect when they were delivered." We have no right to say that God may have given a revelation of himself and his will to man which contains a single error, any more than we have a right to say that he created a world in which sin existed.

And then in the third place, there is a scientific reason for this claim. What is the use of the value of textual criticism if there be no perfect source of Holy Writ? Why do Bible scholars make so much of words, and phrases, and shades of meanings, and comparisons, and manuscripts, and versions, if at the basis of it all there is no ground of certainty? If men drive piles in the earth, it is because they expect to find bottom somewhere, and if men dig into the original roots of the Scriptures, it is because they expect to find, and feel the necessity of finding a solid footing at the end. And, as a matter of fact, they have found this footing. This is not to say that in the present translation of either the Old or New Testaments we have in every instance the word of the original, but this is so nearly so, as to make it practically, true. So far as the Old Testament is concerned, scholars can point out the variant readings and the places that are in doubt here and there, which is the same as to say that the remainder is not in doubt; and the remainder is so nearly the whole that if all the doubtful readings were omitted altogether, they would not affect one essential historical fact or doctrinal teaching. As to the New Testament, it has been already stated that in 999 cases out of every 1,000, we have the very word of the original.

CHAPTER II.

THE ARGUMENT FOR INSPIRATION.

AFTER considering something of the meaning of inspiration, we now inquire about its proof. The writer has always felt that for true Christians —and it is such who are in mind chiefly in the preparation of these "Primers"—one of the strongest arguments for inspiration is that which theologians might call the apriori argument, or the argument from the very nature of the case.

Granted a God such as we know him to be, and granted a human race in the condition we know ourselves to be, and granted a divine purpose of redemption such as we have come to apprehend, and the supernatural and inerrant inspiration of the record of it almost goes without saying. That God would give us just such a revelation, and that he would take care to give it in that form and under those conditions which should remove all doubt as to its source and its authority, are questions scarcely admitting of more than one opinion. From the moment the writer really came to know God, he turned to the Bible as his true and inerrant Word as naturally as the new-born babe turns to its mother's breast, and he has never required for himself any further argument than that which the babe requires.

But he has felt the need of argument for others,

and hence attention is now called to the fact that all that has gone before in these "Primers," as to the genuineness and credibility of the Bible, is to a greater or less extent an argument for its inspiration. To dwell chiefly on what was said about its credibility, no one can sincerely and without prejudice consider the history and contents of the Bible, especially in comparison with the teachings and practices of the other religions of the world, to say nothing of its achievements, without being convinced that it is a revelation from the one only and true God. This consideration has been pointed out several times as progress has been made in our earlier studies.

To be sure, we must admit a distinction between revelation and inspiration. God might have revealed certain things about himself to men without inspiring them to record the same for later generations, but the contention of this chapter is that no small part of the revelation in the Bible carries on the face of it the inspiration of its record as well.

The writer has used an illustration in the "Bulwarks of the Faith," which he may be pardoned for employing again. A certain stenographer and typewriter in a commercial house was given the following letter by dictation from his employer:—"Gentlemen:—We have received your communication and will now fill your order." But to the astonishment of the employer when placed under his eye for signature, it read thus:—"Gentlemen:—We have received your communication, and will

NOT fill your order." A slight error indeed, only a single letter, but what a difference it would have made in the outcome! What was the cause of the error? No want of clearness on the part of the employer in dictating, and no evil intention on the part of the stenographer in doing the work, but simply the infirmity common to man.

Now Moses and Paul and all the other human writers of the Bible were men of like passions and frailties with ourselves. Holy and good they were, thoroughly consecrated to God, and desirous of doing his will, yet how do we know that they have in every case given us the exact transcript of his mind, unless we know that they were guided and controlled in their written revelation of his mind? The employer in the case before us supervised the work of his subordinate and saw that it precisely expressed his thought before it was transmitted to the persons addressed, and God must have done something corresponding to that in the case of the human writers of the Bible, or we have no absolute assurance that we possess his mind.

There is a statement of Peter in his first epistle, 1:10-12, which leads us to believe that God did this very thing. He is speaking of the salvation of which the Old Testament prophets wrote, and tells us that after they had written what was given them to write, they searched diligently concerning the meaning of it, which meaning was subsequently revealed to them. It seems clear from this that

the inspiration of the Scriptures terminates, not upon the thoughts which God gave the writers, but rather upon the words, so that the writers themselves were necessitated to study the words just as we do today in order to ascertain the thoughts that might be back of them.

I am aware that such a view of inspiration is regarded by not a few as quite "unscholarly," but subsequent chapters will show why their criticism or opposition should have little weight in the estimate of any who really accept the Bible as a credible revelation from God. But for the present, I should like to quote in support of what is here said so distinguished a scholar as the Dutch theologian, Dr. Kuyper, who is at the same time one of the greatest statesmen of our day, and until very recently prime minister of Holland.

In a recent address on present-day Biblical criticism, published in the Bibliothaeca Sacra, he does not hesitate to speak of "youthful theologians who deprecate the Scriptures in a way which only betrays that their superficiality echoes what their limited powers fail to grasp." "The present-day protest against the words of Scriptures," he goes on to say, "is judged of itself. The Scripture is God's Word, both as a whole and in its parts. Synthetically, because the extent and the contents of the Holy Scripture have God for their author. * * * The Scripture, however, is also God's Word analytically, i. e., in each of its parts; * * * the actual thoughts of God as well as the thoughts

of men, and even those of Satan, in so far as the Scripture writes them down for us, yea, every song and every narrative of the Bible, even what the godless have dared to undertake against God Almighty, is here placed before us, not with the uncertainty of the human, but under the infallible credential of the divine, i. e., of the Word of the Holy Spirit. The latest dogmatists of Germany abandon more and more the idea of an inspiration which concerns the thoughts, but not the words. Rothe declares—'On the whole, words and thoughts are inseparable. There are no thoughts without words; they cannot be expressed and held fast otherwise than in words and by means of words.' Even the moderns do not deny this any longer. It was pure 'thoughtlessness,' as Rothe called it, to advocate an inspiration of the thoughts and to deny the inspiration of the words."

CHAPTER III.

THE BIBLE CLAIM OF INSPIRATION.

THE strongest testimony to the inspiration of the Bible is the claim of the Bible itself. Nor can it be said that this is reasoning in a circle. If one thinks that to accept the claim of the Bible to its inspiration is like taking a man's own word that he speaks the truth, the reply is that we are not now referring to the truth of the Bible at all, but only to its inspiration. We have already shown the Bible to be true. If what was said in Part II, on its credibility is not sufficient to that end, our lips are closed. But if the Bible be proven to be true, if its statements of facts are credible, we are certainly justified in opening its pages to see what it says about itself.

And this is what it says about itself: 2 Timothy 3:16 declares, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." All Biblical scholars are agreed that "Scripture" in this case refers to the Old Testament just as we have it, from Genesis to Malachi. It does not refer to the New Testament, because at the time these words were written the latter as such was not yet in existence. The words "inspired of God" are a translation of a single Greek word meaning "God-breathed."

The teaching is then, that all the Old Testament, from Genesis to Malachi, is "God-breathed." It

is true that this text is rendered a little differently in the Revised Version, and seems to give license to a theory that part of the Scripture is inspired and part otherwise; but aside from the fact that this is contradivtive to what was said before on this subject, even the revisors themselves are not so certain of their rendering but that they have left the old translation in the margin as an alternative where it is so desired.

Nor are we left to this one testimony for the confirmation of a fact so highly important. Take that in 2 Peter 1:20, 21: "No prophecy ever came in old time by the will of man, but holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (R. V.). "Prophecy" in this case does not necessarily mean the foretelling of events, but the utterance of any word of God, without reference as to time. If, therefore, no word of God ever came in old time by the will of man, we have as strong a declaration of the divine inspiration of that which did come as one could possibly desire.

These sweeping confirmations to the inspiration of the Old Testament moreover are fully corroborated by the way in which the writers of the New Testament introduce quotations from the Old. "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophets," or "As the Holy Ghost saith," are familiar utterances in this connection to every reader of the New Testament. No mere work of man, however great, has ever been alluded to in this way. Who would think of

quoting from Shakespeare, or Goethe, or Victor Hugo, or Tolstoi, or Bancroft, or Motley, thus?

And then add to this, the way in which the writers of the Old Testament themselves allude to their messages. Elsewhere we have quoted the remark of Dr. James H. Brooks, to the effect that no less than two thousand times do they introduce what they are about to say with the formula, or its equivalent, "Thus saith the Lord." Has any writer ever dared to assume this outside of the Bible?

We have said nothing yet as to the testimony of Christ. Does not every reader of the Gospels know how he regarded the source and authority of the Old Testament? Did not he say that "The Scriptures cannot be broken," indicating at the same time what he meant by that remark (John 10:35)? Did he not again and again quote that Scripture as final without note or comment (Matthew 4)? Did he not sometimes use single words of that Scripture as the basis of important doctrines (Matthew 22:31, 32, 40-45)? And did not his apostles follow his example in this respect (Gal. 3:16; Heb. 3:8-11; Heb. 12:26-27)?

So much for the Old Testament, but what may be said for the New? Surely if the former were inspired the latter must be inspired as well, because it is the later and more important revelation of the two. Compare here Hebrews 1:1-2 with 2:1-3. See also such passages as Matthew 1:22-23, Acts 13:19-29, and Gal. 5:6, where the New Testament assumes to explain, prove, and even repeal, certain ordi-

nances of the Old. Would this be likely to be the case if the New Testament were not in some respects of greater authority than the Old?

Again, the writers of the New Testament were of an equal, and in some instances of a higher rank than those of the Old. They were prophets (Romans 16:25-27; Eph. 3:4, 5). But they were more than prophets, they were apostles (1 Cor. 12:27; Eph. 2:20; also Eph. 4:11). In these instances apostles are always spoken of, not without reason doubtless, in precedence of the prophets. And there is harmony in this if their mission was of a higher character. To quote what was said in the "Bulwarks of the Faith," they were sent forth by Christ as he had been sent forth by the Father (John 20:21); they were to go to the whole earth, while the prophets were sent to a single nation only (Matthew 27:19); they were to call out a people to be the church, as the body and the bride of Christ, while the prophets were to make ready an earthly people for the Lord. The whole body of the church epistles in comparison with the Gospels, especially that of Matthew, is in evidence here. It seems plain, therefore, that these considerations contain great weight in determining the authority both in kind and degree by which they (the apostles) spake.

Nor should it be forgotten in the next place, that the writers of the New Testament were especially qualified for their work, as may be seen by reference to Matthew 10:19, 20, Mark 13:11, Luke 12:12,

John 14:26, and 16:13, 14. In some of these instances inspiration of the most absolute character was promised as to what they should speak, but the inference is warranted that none the less would they be inspired in what they should write. Their words spoken were limited and temporary in their sphere, while their words written covered the whole range of revelation and were to last forever. If, therefore, they were inspired in the one case, how much more in the other!

Finally, the writers of the New Testament directly claim divine inspiration. See, for example, Acts 15:27, 1 Cor. 2:13, 1 Thess. 2:13, 2 Peter 3:2, 15, 16, Rev. 2:7. The language of Peter will be found especially strong, since in the first instance he places his own words on a level with those of the prophets of the Old Testament, and in the second he does the same with those of Paul. (Bulwarks of the Faith.)

CHAPTER IV.

THE OBJECTIONS TO INSPIRATION.

OF course there are difficulties in the way of accepting such a view of the inspiration of the Scriptures as has been presented in the preceding chapter. But these difficulties are not new and they faze no one who really understands the subject. Every one of them has been considered centuries ago and answered again and again. How little weight they have with thinking people who are at the same time devout and know the Lord, may be gathered from the fact that they have not influenced any great creed of Christendom at any time.

No better illustration of this can be found than the declaration of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church as recent as 1893, when it pronounced "the Bible as we now have it in its various translations and revisions, when freed from all errors and mistakes of translators, copyists, and printers, to be the very Word of God, consequently wholly without error."

That is the doctrine of verbal inspiration of the original autographs put forth by a body of men in the last decade of the nineteenth century who cannot be surpassed within the bounds of Christendom, for influential standing, acute learning, and earnest consecration to God. No one need be

ashamed to stand on the same platform with such men even if he be called disagreeable names, and pilloried as holding a theory "untenable" and "absurd."

One thing more may be said, however, and that is that the difficulties in the way of such a view of inspiration are altogether insignificant in comparison with the difficulties in the way of any other view whatsoever. No other view can be presented whose difficulties are not overwhelmingly greater, while this has the infinite advantage of being the Bible view itself. No other view can claim the testimony of the Bible to its truth.

In the previous work of the author the alleged objections and difficulties have been considered and answered somewhat in detail. They include that from the variety in the styles of the different authors, the differences in the narratives, the supposed discrepancies between certain statements of the Bible and the facts of history and natural science, certain declarations of the Scripture themselves apparently contradictory, and so on. Space will not permit quotation here, and the reader can only be referred to the "Bulwarks of the Faith," pages 145 to 159.

But there is one difficulty not referred to there which may be dwelt upon in this connection somewhat in length: for example, that of two reports of the same event which seem irreconcilable to those who know nothing of the events but what is contained in the reports. Such difficulties are some-

times suggested by the reading of the Gospels, and the following illustration of how easily reconcilable they are when all the facts are known may be in point.

The quotation is from a current writer who speaks of a young man who was asked about his salary in the middle of June, and who said it was fifty dollars a month. At the end of June he was asked the same question, and said it was sixty dollars a month. He was then asked how long he had been receiving the latter sum, and he said since the first of April. Apparently here is an irreconcilable contradiction until it is subsequently learned that between the middle of June and the end of it, he had been informed that his salary had been increased from fifty to sixty dollars a month, and that the increase dated from the first of April. His answers, therefore, in both cases were not only true, but the only truthful answers that under the circumstances could have been made.

Closely related to this kind of difficulty is another where one of the Gospel narratives refers to one person as its subject, while another refers to two in the same connection. To quote the same writer, this is one of the objections raised by Prof. Huxley in his controversy with Prof. Wace. "The most unabashed of reconcilers cannot well say that one man is the same as two, or two as one." In the "Reminiscences of Philander Chase" there is a narrative by the Bishop's mother, written for her children, of how she followed her husband into the

wilderness before he had erected so much as a tent to live in. She had been left, with her seven children, at a fort fifteen miles distant from the new settlement, but, getting weary of her life there, availed herself of the first opportunity to escape from it.

"She writes: 'Walking along the banks of the river one evening I saw, as the day drew to its close, a canoe coming round a point of the river bank above me. I first thought of the approach of savages, but before I had time to flee I recognized the well known canoe of your father and in it our trusted neighbor Diah Spalding.' The narrative occupies about 1,500 words, but no other boatman is mentioned as arriving and taking her and her children back, while one sentence seems to be exclusive of any other. Thus the matter stands in the copy of the work to be found in the Astor Library; but in the copy I have seen in the Congressional Library there is this note: 'The writer has since learned from his eldest brother, Simeon, of Bethel, Vt., that there was one other man sent down with the boat. The same brother confirmed the truth of this narrative.' The reason Mrs. Chase mentioned only one may have been that he was the only one she recognized as the boat turned the corner, and that in all the subsequent doings the other filled a subordinate role; but, whatever the cause, the fact remains, that she mentioned only one boatman, while her eldest son, who was present on the occasion, and was old

enough to assist in propelling the canoe, declared there were two. Here, then, are truthful records of the nineteenth century, written in the most natural manner, which are exactly parallel with those Gospel narratives which are thought to be so much at variance that they cannot all be true."

I draw this chapter to a close by quoting parts of two or three paragraphs of Dr. Charles Hodge, where he is treating of this subject in his great work on Systematic Theology.

"It is beyond question," says he, "that in the light of all the Scriptures themselves assert or disclose as to the nature and extent of the divine influence controlling their genesis, and as to their authority over man's conscience and life as the voice of God, the existence of any such "discrepancies," (as are sometimes alleged) is a violent improbability. Those who assert their existence must bring them out, and prove to the community of competent judges (1), that they occurred in the original autographs, (2), that the interpretation made by the objectors and which occasions the discrepancy is the only possible one, (3), that the matter is essentially incapable of being reconciled. It is sufficient for the present purpose to state that no such discrepancy has ever been proved to exist with such clearness as to secure the recognition of the community of believing scholars. Difficulties and apparently irreconcilable statements exist, but advancing knowledge is removing these even if it is discovering others, and the probability is that perfect knowledge will remove all."

How to Conduct a Sunday School

2nd Edition. 12mo, Cloth, net $1.25. **MARION LAWRANCE**

General Secretary of the International Sunday School Association

"Packed full of useful information. Filled with details, specific and practical, for which a host of workers have longed and prayed. The book gives the cream of life-long experience and observation. In its concrete details lies its unique and practical service."—*The Examiner.*

Pencil Points for Preacher and Teacher

With an Introduction by Rev. Robert S. McArthur, D.D.

Illustrated, Cloth, net $1 25. **ROBERT F. Y. PIERCE**

Dr. Pierce is the recognized exponent of the art of conveying Scripture truth by means of blackboard sketches and object lessons. Crowded with illustrations of blackboard drawings and suggestions and forms a fitting companion to his popular book, "Pictured Truth."

Kindergarten Bible Stories Old Testament.

Illustrated, 12mo, Cloth, net $1.25 **By LAURA E. CRAGIN.**

Devoted to the stories of which the little folks never tire, but told in the inimitable style for which this author has an exceptional gift as well as a peculiar discernment in bringing out the lesson of value.

How to Plan a Lesson And other Talks to Sunday School Teachers.

2nd Edition. 16mo, Cloth, net 50c. **MARIANNA C. BROWN**

"Suggestive, interesting, valuable.....The writer is an experienced teacher, who has made proof of her theories, and who is well able to make valuable suggestions."—*Herald and Presbyter.*

The Gist of the Lesson—1906

Leather, net 25c (*Vest pocket size*) **R. A. TORREY**

Interleaved, Leather, net 50c

The seventh annual issue of this multum in parvo upon the International Sunday School lessons. A most popular exposition. Nearly fifty thousand copies sold annually.

Practical S. S. Lesson Commentary For 1906

Carefully prepared by specialists in the various departments with Map and Blackboard exercises. 8vo, Cloth, 50c. net, postage extra.

Its practical value and marked spiritual expositions have given it a permanent place FOURTEENTH YEAR.

The Twentieth Century New Testament

Final Revised Translation 1905.

Cloth, net $1.00; Morocco, net $1.50; Morocco, gilt edges, net $2.00. Morocco Divinity Circuit, net $3.50; India Paper Edition, net $5.00.

All criticism has now been carefully considered and the results embodied in the New Revised and Final Edition. This is the product of thirteen years labor by a score of translators and is practically a new translation.

The Evangelistic Note

A study of needs and methods, together with a series of direct appeals.

3rd Edition. 12mo, Cloth, net $1.25. **W. J. DAWSON**

"One of the most remarkable and stirring of recent books. It is really the story of a great crisis in the life of a great preacher. Mr. Dawson's experience in his own church has justified his faith, and his book is a most stimulating treatise on homiletics and pastoral theology. It is epoch-making in character."—*The Watchman.*

Torrey and Alexander

The Story of a World-Wide Revival

A record and study of the work and personality of the Evangelists DR. R. A. TORREY, D. D., and CHARLES M. ALEXANDER.

Illustrated, 12mo, Cloth, net $1.00. **GEORGE T. B. DAVIS**

The multitudes who have followed the marvellous progress of the religious awakening in Australasia, India, and Great Britain, accompanying the efforts of these evangelists will eagerly welcome this glimpse from the inside of their career, personality and work. Mr. Davis has been associated in a confidential capacity with the work of the two evangelists, and writes with keen appreciation of the interesting facts in stirring language.

Real Salvation and Whole-Hearted Service

A second volume of Revival Addresses.

12mo, Cloth, net $1.00. **R. A. TORREY**

The multitudes led to decision in connection with the preaching of these sermons, gives assurance that their influence will be extended far beyond the reach of the speaker's voice. Positive conviction and a loving plea as from a God-sent messenger, are the marked features of this new volume.

Talks to Men

About the Bible and the Christ of the Bible.

12mo, Cloth, net 75c. **R. A. TORREY**

"The directness, simplicity, with wide scholarship and literary charm of these talks, and unhesitating claim for the highest and fullest inspiration, inerrancy and authority for the Bible, make them trumpet calls to faith."—*N. Y. Observer.*

The Passion for Souls

16mo, Cloth, net 50c. **J. H. JOWETT**

Seven sermons on tenderness, watchfulness, companionship, rest and vision of the apostle Paul's passion for human souls. This little volume shows his keen, reverent insight at its best and is made rich with abundant and well chosen illustrations.

The Worker's Weapon

It's Perfection, Authority and Use.

16mo, Cloth, net 25 cents. **JOHN H. ELLIOTT**

"A fine presentation of the unquestionable authority of God's Word and pointed and clear directions and illustrations of how to study and use the Bible."

IMPORTANT ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES

The Universal Elements of the Christian Religion

12mo, Cloth, net $1.25. **CHARLES CUTHBERT HALL**

Amid the flood of books on the subject of religion there appears every few years one book that dwarfs all others, one that crystalizes the thinking of the Christian world. Such is this book. This man separates himself from the bewildering crossed paths and standing free, grasps clearly the course that is being followed by the Christian age of which he is a part. His knowledge is cosmopolitan and accurate, his logic is clean cut and simple, and his conclusions convincing and optimistic, springing from a faith at once simple and profound in its certainty that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of the world of men who are his possession.

Paths to Power

2nd Edition. 12mo, Cloth, net $1.25. **F. W. GUNSAULUS**

"Not till now has Dr. Gunsaulus put a volume of his discourses into print. On reading them one is disposed to concede his right to the place assigned him by Prof. Wilkinson in the list with such men as Belcher, Brooks and Spurgeon. Dr. Gunsaulus resembles Dr. Joseph Parker in the vivifying imagination which he brings to the exposition of his texts, and is a master in allegorizing from them, fresh and profound lessons."—*The Outlook.*

Humanity and God

And other Sermons.

12mo, Cloth, net $1.50. **SAMUEL CHADWICK**

"In every sermon the preacher looks at man in the light of God and strives to show that in the visitation of God in Christ the hope of humanity centres. The author treats with great force and freshness a subject on which plain practical teaching is in our own time much needed."—*Methodist Times.*

Loyalty: The Soul of Religion

12mo, Cloth, net $1.00. **J. G. K. McCLURE**

"Dr. McClure sets forth the idea with a clearness not surpassed in terature, and in a great variety of illustration, argument and appeal. . . . a great book to give to a young man of the college type. It takes him as he is and takes hold of best possibilities in him."—*N. Y. Observer.*

Our Attitude as Pastors

Toward Modern Biblical Criticism

Paper, net 10c **PROF. LOUIS RUFFET**

An address to the students of the Theological Seminary of the Free Evangelical Church, of Geneva, Switzerland.

The Choice of the Highest

City Temple Talks to Young Men.

12mo, Cloth, net $1.00. **REGINALD J. CAMPBELL, M.A.**

"These messages to the great audiences of men of business are of a high level of thought and expression. They are especially directed to young men, and present ideals of life and conduct in winning appeals. Mr. Campbell is a virile thinker with a fineness of feeling, which makes him a power in the pulpit which he holds."—*Christian Intelligencer.*

Christianity as Taught by Christ

A series of discourses on the teachings of Jesus.

12mo, Cloth, net $1.25. **HENRY STILES BRADLEY**

"Because he knows the present conditions of New Testament lore and is alert with the spirits of modern life, Dr. Bradley's discourses possess a value both unique and practical.....Stirring, instructive, simple, easy to read and easy to understand, appealing to faith and inciting to practice"—*Atlanta Constitution.*

Christ and Men

12mo, Cloth, net $1.20 **DAVID J. BURRELL**

Dr. Burrell's sermons have a standard quality that marks all of his writing. This series of sermons is intended to set out the human side of Jesus' character as shown in his interviews with men, his tact, his discernment, his delicate handling of people.

The Apostle Peter

Outline Studies in his Life, Character and Writings.

12mo, Cloth, net $1.25. **W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS**

"An excellent example of what Biblical analysis should be and should lead to. It is scholarly, logical, perspicuous, and sets forth the main truths of each passage treated in a particularly exact and luminous way."—*Advance.*

The Culture of Simplicity

By the author of "Heavenly Harmonies."

2nd Edition. 12mo, Cloth, net $1.00. **MALCOLM J. McLEOD**

"The first suspicion of imitation is quickly dispelled. The book stands on its own merits. More vivacious, more practical for the American reader than Charles Wagner's 'The Simple Life.' It explains more clearly how the life may be lived, and reaches the root of things in the Gospel of Christ."—*Congregationalist.*

Elims of Life

And other sermons.

12mo, Cloth, net $1.00. **J. D. JONES**

"Mr. Jones is of the general type of thought with which Mr. Dawson of London has made so many American audiences familiar. In these discourses the form is plain and lucid, the aim is practical."—*The Outlook.*

Young Men Who Overcame

12mo, Cloth, net $1.00. **ROBERT E. SPEER**

"These fifteen condensed biographies exhibit the power and beauty of Christian principle in strong and active natures, who made their mark in whatever they undertook—athletics, scholarship, business, Christian missions.—*The Outlook.*

STUDIES ON BIBLICAL THEMES

The Witness of Sin A Theodicy

12mo, Cloth, net $1.00. **NATHAN ROBINSON WOOD**

A splendidly thought-out presentation of the problem presented by the presence of sin in a world dominated by God. Some sort of a theodicy, some conception of the solution of this question is necessary to any religious thinking. Mr. Wood's work is a marked addition to present-day theology.

The Walk, Conversation and Character of Jesus Christ Our Lord

12mo, Cloth, net $1.50. **ALEXANDER WHYTE**

"Rich and glowing meditations on the life of our Lord. A genuine contribution to Christology. What distinguishes it most is the author's singularly clear perception of Christ alone without sin. While always in touch with real life, Dr. Whyte has that power of separating himself from the stream of things which is essential to a great religious teacher."—*British Weekly* (*Robertson Nicoll, Editor.*)

Jesus of Nazareth, the Anointed of God

Or, The Inner History of a Consecrated Life.

12mo, Cloth, net 75c. **P. COOK, M.A.**

"As a brief and concise summary, a bird's-eye view of the life of Jesus this volume will be of value."—*Reformed Church Messenger.*

The Divine Tragedy A Drama of the Christ

12mo. Cloth, net, $1.00. **PEYTON H. HOGE**

The author's ambition is "to tell in the most vivid and practical form for men living in the world to-day the story of Jesus of Nazareth in its culminating scenes." One could exhaust adjectives in praise of the author's management of the dramatic form and his blank verse. It is a wonderful work. The dedicatory poem alone is of such surpassing beauty that one will never forget it.

The Directory of the Devout Life

A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount.

12mo, Cloth, net $1.00. **F. B. MEYER, M.A.**

"In many respects the best writings Mr. Meyer has issued. They are eminently practical, and the pointed and piercing ideas of the Master are explained and brought home to personal character and life in an illuminating and stimulating way."—*Watchman.*

With the Sorrowing A Pastor's Handbook.

16mo, Cloth flex., net 75 cts. Edited by **F. W. PALMER**

Presented with confidence to pastors, missionaries and other visitors in the homes of sorrow, as likely to prove a most valuable aid in their trying experiences. Although primarily a service book for funerals, it is vastly more than this. With Scripture selections of exceptional suggestive values and a collection of poems of comfort both rare and striking the little volume will be greatly prized.

BIBLICAL STUDIES.

Studies in the Life of the Christian
His Faith and His Service.

16mo, Cloth, net 50c.; paper, net 25c. **H. T. SELL**

This work, prepared especially for the use of Bible Classes and study circles, forms the seventh of the series of most popular manuals by Dr. Sell, and well completes the whole. Every phase of the Christian life and its relations is dealt with.

Outline Studies in the New Testament
Philippians to Hebrews.

12mo, Cloth, net $1.20. **PROF. WILLIAM G. MOOREHEAD**

"It is a book for thoughtful students of the Bible and will be found very helpful and satisfactory by preachers in preparation of sermons and by Bible class teachers."—*The Watchman.*

Students Chronological New Testament
With historical notes and brief outline on each Book, by

8vo, Cloth, net $1.00. **PROF. A. T. ROBERTSON**

"The text used is taken from the American Standard edition of the revised version, and the books are considered in accordance with the generally accepted theory of their chronology. Each book is preceded by a brief synopsis and outline The volume is designed for all readers and students of the New Testament."—*Epworth Herald.*

The Biblical Illustrator
New vols. in Old Testament Series.

Large 8vo, Cloth, $2.00 each vol.

Edited by **JOSEPH S. EXELL**

Psalms, vol. 1 [Psa. i. to xxvi.].	Jeremiah, vol. 1.
Isaiah, vol 1, [Chapter i. to xxx.].	Minor Prophets, vol. 1.
Deuteronomy—in one volume.	Minor Prophets, vol. 2.

The Men of the Bible by the Men of the Century
In Seventeen Handsome Cloth Volumes

Formerly $17.00, now $6.00 net, per set.

Edited by **JOSEPH S. EXELL, M. A.**

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Moses, Joshua, Gideon and Judges, Kings of Israel and Judah, David, Solomon, Samuel, and Saul, Daniel, Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezra and Nehmiah, Minor Prophets, St. Paul, Jesus Christ. *Send for circular of our special terms.*

BOOKLETS.

Waxwing
The Story of a College Girl's Awakening.

Boards, 30c. **CAROLINE ATWATER MASON**

The story of a healthy-minded college girl whose views of life are transformed by the accidental meeting with a returned missionary.

Breaking the Record.
Two booklets by the author of The Sky Pilot, The Prospector, etc.

The Swan Creek Blizzard

Art boards, each 30c. **RALPH CONNOR**

Sure to receive a large welcome among many admirers.

Date Due

THE KING'S LIBRARY
3000050917